INTERSTATE MIGRATION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

THIRD SESSION

PURSUANT TO

H. Res. 63 and H. Res. 491

RESOLUTIONS TO INQUIRE INTO THE INTERSTATE
MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS, TO STUDY,
SURVEY, AND INVESTIGATE THE SOCIAL AND
ECONOMIC NEEDS AND THE MOVEMENT OF
INDIGENT PERSONS ACROSS STATE LINES

PART 7

LOS ANGELES HEARINGS

SEPTEMBER 28, 1940

Printed for the use of the Select Committee to Investigate the
Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens

MEDICAL SCHOOL
LIBRARY

SIGILLVM · VNIVERSITATIS · CALIFORNIENSIS
FIAT LVX
MDCCCLXVIII

EX LIBRIS

Gift of
Hon. John H. Tolan

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012

http://archive.org/details/nationaldefensem07unit

INTERSTATE MIGRATION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS

Congress
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

THIRD SESSION

PURSUANT TO

H. Res. 63 and H. Res. 491

RESOLUTIONS TO INQUIRE INTO THE INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS, TO STUDY, SURVEY, AND INVESTIGATE THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC NEEDS AND THE MOVEMENT OF INDIGENT PERSONS ACROSS STATE LINES

PART 7

LOS ANGELES HEARINGS

SEPTEMBER 28, 1940

Printed for the use of the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
260370 WASHINGTON : 1941

R

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE INTERSTATE MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS

JOHN H. TOLAN, California, *Chairman*

CLAUDE V. PARSONS, Illinois	CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama	FRANK C. OSMERS Jr., New Jersey

Dr. ROBERT K. LAMB, *Chief Investigator*
ELMER A. REESE, *Secretary*

RICHARD S. BLAISDELL, *Editor*
HAROLD D. CULLEN, *Associate Editor*

Dr. EDWARD J. ROWELL, *Chief Field Investigator*

HD5856
U5A5
v.7
1941

LIST OF WITNESSES

Los Angeles Hearings, September 28, 1940

Page
Davis, Mrs. Jean, mother of Bette O'Neill, (q. v.) Address: Box 271, Mar Vista, Calif ---- 2864
Hallgren, Arthur, former Minnesota body-shop worker. Address: 431 West Ninety-first Place, Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2931
Higgenbottom, Thomas Benjamin Harrison (with his wife Maude, two daughters, June and Mary, and son Dale) former Oklahoma farmer. Address: Fresno, Calif ---- 2811
Huxley, H. D., California director, farm placement service, United States Employment Service. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2834
Milhorn, Edward, former railroad man and farmer. Address: Highland Park, Monterey Road, Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2933
Montgomery, Harvey, son of Marvin Montgomery (q. v.). Address: Migratory Labor Camp, Shafter, Calif ---- 2902
Montgomery, Marvin, former Oklahoma farmer. Address: Migratory Labor Camp, Shafter, Calif ---- 2902
McCarthy, James Patrick, former Pennsylvania laborer. Address: 2720 South Raymond, Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2914
O'Dwyer, Rt. Rev. Thomas J., general director of charities, Catholic Welfare Bureau of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Inc., Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2827
O'Neill, Bette, migrant movie extra. Address: Box 271, Mar Vista, Calif ---- 2862
Robertson, Robert B., assistant director of industrial relations, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. Address: Burbank, Calif ---- 2804, 2805, 2809
Rubinow, S. G., Administrator, California State Relief Administration. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2867, 2888
Schreiber, Lawrence C., chief deputy superintendent, Department of Charities, Los Angeles County. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2912
Snyder, Ralph, former Minnesota farmer and laborer. Address: Bellflower, Calif ---- 2824
Stewart, Dr. Wendy, representative, Council of Social Agencies of Los Angeles. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2918
Stockburger, Alvin E., representative of Mayor Fletcher Bowron of Los Angeles. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2803
Wagenet, Richard G., director, California State Department of Employment. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2834
Wagner, Rev. Clarence, pastor Florence Avenue Methodist Church and chairman of the Ministerial Migrants Committee. Address: Los Angeles, Calif ---- 2923, 2926

52681-C

STATEMENTS AND MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY WITNESSES

Subject and author	Witness	Page
Letter from Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.	Robt. B. Robertson	2804
Statement on aviation training schools issued by Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.		2803
The migratory boy and young man	Thos. J. O'Dwyer	2830
Ruling as to placement of labor during labor disputes.	R. G. Wagenet	2843
Revised report of California Department of Employment.	R. G. Wagenet	2847
Problem of interstate migration	S. G. Rubinow	2871
Report on transient program by James B. Reese.	S. G. Rubinow	2888
Effect of Migration on Community Life	Clarence Wagner	2924
Letter concerning Marvin Montgomery, from S. G. Rubinow.		2917
Letter from Gov. H. H. Blood of Utah, accompanied by The Problem of Population Migration in Utah, by Thornton W. Petersen of the State Planning Board of Utah.	The Chairman	2938, 2939
Farm Security Administration work in Utah, by Dwain Pearson.	The Chairman	2945
Statement of United States Representative Harry R. Shepard, of California.	The Chairman	2949
Increase in cost of schools in Pinal County, Ariz., by John J. Bugg, county school superintendent.	John W. Abbott	2951
Letter and statement of Walter C. Smith, county supervisor, Pinal County, Ariz.	John W. Abbott	2952
Letter from Floyd G. Brown, secretary of Pinal County (Ariz.) Board of Social Security and Public Welfare.	John W. Abbott	2954
Letter and statement of Bertram P. Brown, director of public health, California State Department of Public Health, on tuberculosis among transients.	John W. Abbott	2956
Letter and statement of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, by F. L. S. Harmon, secretary.	John W. Abbott	2960
Newspaper clippings about border patrol, 1935–37, Los Angeles Herald-Express.	John W. Abbott	2961
Opinion of U. S. Webb, former attorney general of California in re legality of border patrol.	John W. Abbott	2967
General data on migrant problem of Los Angeles County, Calif., by Stephen A. Eross.	John W. Abbott	2969
Report on indigent alien transients, by James E. Davis, superintendent of police of Los Angeles.	John W. Abbott	2978

STATEMENTS AND MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY WITNESSES—Continued

Subject and author	Witness	Page
Material submitted by the county of Los Angeles, including correspondence between Fred R. Rauch of the Work Projects Administration and Congressman Leland M. Ford.	John W. Abbott	2987, 2994
"The Fifth Migration" a report on California agricultural workers by Dr. George Gleason, executive secretary of the Los Angeles County Committee for Church and Community Cooperation.	John W. Abbott	2995
Transiency in Southern California, a report by James E. Davis, former chief of Los Angeles Police Department.	John W. Abbott	3012
Letter from Mrs. Esther R. Elder, general secretary of the city of Pasadena Welfare Bureau.	John W. Abbott	3030
Letter from Katherine M. Cobb, of 739 Garland Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.	John W. Abbott	3031
Letter from Joseph Willis, 125 Weller St., Los Angeles, Calif.	John W. Abbott	3033
Letter from Eric H. Thomsen, Solvang, Calif.	John W. Abbott	3033
Copies of 6 California legislative bills dealing with relief.	John W. Abbott	3035
The Migrant Situation in Madera County, Calif., by Dr. Lee A. Stone, health officer (other material held in committee files).	John W. Abbott	3050
Statement by the Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.	John W. Abbott	3062
Articles of incorporation, Agricultural Labor Bureau of San Joaquin Valley	John W. Abbott	3065
Migration into California in the 1920's, by Edwin Bates		3066

INTERSTATE MIGRATION

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1940

House of Representatives,
Select Committee to Investigate the
Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 9:30 a. m., in the circuit court of appeals hearing room, United States Courthouse and Post Office Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. John H. Tolan (chairman), presiding:

Present: Representatives John H. Tolan (chairman), John J. Sparkman, and Frank C. Osmers, Jr. Absent: Claude V. Parsons and Carl T. Curtis.

Also present: Edward J. Rowell, chief field investigator; John W. Abbott, field investigator in charge; Abe Kramer, field investigator; and Alice M. Tuohy, secretary.

The Chairman. The committee will please come to order.

Mr. Stockburger, you will be the first witness.

WELCOME BY ARLIN E. STOCKBURGER, REPRESENTATIVE OF MAYOR FLETCHER BOWRON, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. Stockburger. Honorable committee members, I want to say a word of welcome to the committee on behalf of Mayor Bowron who is on the high seas in a plane returning to Los Angeles, and who will land at San Francisco today. He has been in the South Seas for a month.

Mayor Bowron, I know, would be here this morning if he were in the city. In talking to the chairman of the city council, Mr. Burns, he asked me to convey his respects to the committee and assure you of his interest in the program.

Secretary Wallace is here today, and the chairman of the city council is doing the honors to the Secretary and will be very busy this morning and around noon time, so he couldn't be present.

The city of Los Angeles is the hub of this migrant problem in Southern California, of course. The city has no legal responsibility for caring for indigents and participating in this relief problem. It is primarily under State law and is a county problem. However, it is very close to us and we do have a department of social welfare that is working with the recognized agencies in handling this problem. We are most happy that the Federal Government has recognized the seriousness of the situation in California and what we are confronted with, especially in Southern California, in connection with the migrant problem and we are here to assure you that we will cooperate in every way possible in trying to furnish information to aid you in arriving at your conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I want to simply say to you that we opened our hearings in New York on June 29, and the first witness in these hearings was Mayor LaGuardia of New York. He considers that interstate migration is a national problem, and as president of the Mayors' Conference he is contacting every mayor in the United States on the subject. We are also contacting the Governor of each State.

On behalf of the committee we wish you to express our thanks to the mayor and to the city council, and extend to them our very best wishes, and say to them that our records will not close until the final hearing in Washington the last week of November, and if you have any further material you may send it to our committee at Washington and we will insert it in the record.

Thank you very much, Mr. Stockburger.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT B. ROBERTSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION, BURBANK, CALIF.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Robertson, will you give your full name and address and occupation to the reporter, please.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Robert B. Robertson. Do you want my business address?

Mr. OSMERS. Your business connection and your address.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Assistant director of industrial relations at the Lockheed Aircraft Co., Burbank, Calif.

MIGRATION TO AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Robertson, you have submitted a letter to the committee here in reference to the applications for employment that you have received in a typical week at the Lockheed plant here. It seems from this letter of yours that a great many of these people that apply to you are interstate migrants.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
Burbank, Calif., September 21, 1940.

Dr. E. J. ROWELL,
Chief Field Investigator, House Committee on Interstate Migration,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DR. ROWELL: At the request of Mr. J. W. Abbott we have compiled some hurried statistics regarding the locale of the men who are applying for jobs at Lockheed. This information represents a tabulation covering about 1 week's time and totals 2,050 applicants of whom 1,450 did not have the necessary training or skill to warrant a second consideration on our part and the tabulation below includes only those 1,450 men who we feel might possibly be or become a social burden.

Los Angeles County	825	Indiana	7
State	114	North Dakota	6
Texas	43	Kentucky	5
Illinois	34	Hawaii	4
Nebraska	29	Louisiana	4
Colorado	26	Alabama	3
Kansas	25	Nevada	3
Missouri	24	Maryland	3
Arizona	23	Washington, D. C	3
Ohio	19	Massachusetts	2
Iowa	16	Tennessee	2
Oklahoma	15	Florida	2
Michigan	13	Wyoming	2
Minnesota	13	South Africa	1
South Dakota	12	Connecticut	1
Washington	12	Arkansas	1
Wisconsin	10	West Virginia	1
Idaho	9	Virginia	1
New York	9	New Jersey	1
Montana	9	Rhode Island	1
New Mexico	8	South Carolina	1
Oregon	7		

You will note that the out-of-State applicants make up about 35 percent of the total and at the present rate the total would be approximately 26,000 unskilled for a 12-month period. We handle from 10,000 to 12,000 applicants per month and have increased our personnel from 3,000 to almost 14,000 within the past 2 years.

As you no doubt know a large number of so-called aircraft technical schools have recently and suddenly sprung into existence here in Southern California. The majority of the schools are poorly equipped and poorly staffed, and the value of the training given by them is practically nil. Some of these so-called schools have been and are still sending representatives to other States (mainly the midwestern States) and by the use of high pressure methods and actual promises of jobs at extremely high rates are inducing a large number of young men to come to Southern California. We feel certain that there is a wealth of material right in this vicinity from which all of the qualified schools could easily draw the enrollment for short courses for training in production jobs. We quite naturally give every preference to local boys in hiring those who have completed the courses of the few schools which offer training of value.

We have consistently advised strongly against unskilled workers coming to California in the hope of employment in the aircraft industry and have publicized this in newspapers on a country-wide basis.

I will be glad to appear personally before your committee on September 28, 1940, and would appreciate information as to the exact time.

Very truly yours,

R. B. Robertson,
Assistant Director, Industrial Relations.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT B. ROBERTSON—Resumed

Mr. Osmers. Now what conclusion do you reach in that tabulation?

Mr. Robertson. Well, we reach this conclusion out there, that from 35 to 50 percent of the applicants at Lockheed are out-of-State people and that, I should say, approximately 75 percent of those people from out of State are not employable at Lockheed.

I also might add that these technical schools or so-called technical schools are, in my opinion, a bigger problem than the publicity that the aircraft industry has received in the past year or so because they are really going out after boys from back through the midwestern States and other States and pulling them into Southern California, rather than having the boys come out here cold with the expectation of getting a job in the aircraft industry.

Mr. Osmers. Would you say that the expansion of the national defense program has acted as a magnet to bring these young men here from other parts of the country?

Mr. Robertson. To a certain extent.

Mr. Osmers. Now, I wonder if you would explain to the committee the apparent discrepancy between statements made by various labor organizations that there is an adequate supply of skilled labor available here and the statement made by some men in the aircraft industry that there is not a sufficient supply of skilled labor.

Mr. Robertson. We still maintain that there is not. As a matter of fact, we are recruiting throughout the East for skilled laborers constantly.

Chairman Tolan. Right now?

Mr. Robertson. Right now.

Mr. Osmers. For what type of work are you seeking those men?

Mr. Robertson. Well, I want to say, first, that we are not going after any man out of the industries that are so-called essential and vital to the defense program, and also I might add that 90 percent of the men that we do get, skilled men, are employed now. We are very careful to stay away from industries that are considered vital to the defense program.

Mr. Osmers. Why do they come with your organization? Do you offer them a better proposition?

Mr. Robertson. In a majority of cases I should say that the rates of pay are not any more than they are receiving at the present time.

Mr. Osmers. Do you offer steadier work or better conditions?

Mr. Robertson. It might be steadier and, of course, the California attraction is there, too. There are a lot of people throughout the country that want to come to California, and we have found that that is a selling point.

AIRCRAFT TECHNICAL SCHOOLS [1]

Mr. Osmers. Now you have touched on a point there before, and I would like to go into it a little further. These aircraft technical schools that you have mentioned, would you describe those in detail for the committee, the establishment and the type of work they do and their value?

Mr. Robertson. Well, some of them are all right. Some of them are well equipped, well staffed with good instructors, and turn out a boy that is useful to us; but they are very much in the minority. I would say you could count those on the fingers of one hand.

Others have sprung up where they get together a bunch of material and they throw that in front of the boy when he comes out and he reads that, and perhaps they might give him a few hours with a rivet gun or something like that, and consider him a graduate. Those boys we cannot use.

Mr. Osmers. May I ask you how they solicit the boys for those schools that do not deliver the education that they say they will?

Mr. Robertson. Well, I wouldn't like to say that this is a definite accusation, but we have had any number of reports—and I think authentic reports—that these schools send representatives back through the Midwestern States and even back into some of the Eastern

---

[1] See p. 1523, Lincoln hearings, pt. 4

States, who make promises and statements that they are connected with the aircraft companies and some of them say that the aircraft companies own these schools. They promise rates up to $1.50 an hour after 5 or 6 weeks of training, which is absolutely untrue. It is not possible because even the best of the schools that turn out boys that we can employ we put through a brush-up course at our plant before we put them to work. Those are the boys that come out of the better schools.

I want to state that I think that these schools that are not qualified present one of our biggest problems as far as the aircraft industry is concerned in bringing out people from other States, and the majority of these people have to sacrifice in order to raise the money to pay the tuition.

Mr. OSMERS. You don't happen to know what a typical tuition would be, do you?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should say around $150 for 5 or 6 weeks, or a 4 weeks' course.

Mr. OSMERS. That is almost equal to some college tuition for a whole year, isn't it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. OSMERS. Here is a question that may be beyond your knowledge. If it is, just say so. Are these schools licensed under any governmental authority, or are they just independent private businesses?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I cannot answer that definitely.

Mr. OSMERS. You don't know whether they are or not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. OSMERS. Do you believe that they ought to be regulated if they are not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I certainly believe they should be.

Mr. OSMERS. Or better regulated if they are being regulated?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. The California Labor Code cannot do anything to regulate them, as I understand it, unless they charge the boys for an attempt at getting them a job in an aircraft plant. If they make a charge for securing employment they would come under the employment agency section of the California Labor Code, but they are careful not to do that.

Mr. OSMERS. Now, when we had hearings in Lincoln, Nebr., Mr. Robertson, several letters from aircraft companies were offered and placed in our record at that time. I believe at least one of these letters charged that some of the aircraft companies were enticing skilled labor away from certain other industries after these other industries had taken the trouble to train the men involved.

Do you know whether that is a common practice in the aircraft industry, or not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I think——

Mr. OSMERS (interrupting). I think you have said that before.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think I made my statement before on that.

Mr. OSMERS. That you people recruit?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We will take skilled men away from industries that are not considered vital to the national defense program. We have done it and unless we are stopped we will continue to do it.

Mr. OSMERS. I am quite sure that you are familiar with the residence requirements that hold today in most States of the Union. I believe the California residence law is 5 years—3 or 5 years—and do you feel, speaking for the aircraft industry in California, that if that law remains on the books that it will increase your difficulties in recruiting men to come to this State?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, I don't; because, as I say, we recruit only skilled personnel that we cannot hire in this locality. I think I stated before that 90 percent or better of these men are already working and have good jobs. They don't think about the fact that they might become a burden upon any State or community.

Mr. OSMERS. When you bring a man here from the Middle West, do you pay his carfare?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In some instances.

Mr. OSMERS. Do you guarantee his carfare back?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. OSMERS. You do not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. OSMERS. I think that is about all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When you bring one here you bring him here under the expectation of his going to work?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we don't bring anyone here unless he does go to work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, he is employed by your company before he comes here?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He is employed before he comes here.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And if they are efficient, they have no difficulty in maintaining that position?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Are these schools that you speak of—I have seen a great many of them with their ads, or read of them—enticing young men to come here to become skilled in the various trades in effect in the aircraft industry—are they simply doing a poor grade of work, in your opinion, or are some of them outright frauds?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That statement I wouldn't care to make. I will say that the majority of them turn out a product that isn't very useful or isn't useful at all to the aircraft industry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Their product is not what you would class as skilled under any interpretation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is all.

(Following is a copy of a statement issued by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, in the form of a four-page booklet, in regard to the above-mentioned schools:)

A STATEMENT REGARDING AVIATION TRAINING SCHOOLS AND EMPLOYMENT IN AIRCRAFT FACTORIES IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.

(Published by Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce)

To Whom It May Concern:

In answer to thousands of inquiries from all sections of the country regarding employment opportunities in the Los Angeles County aircraft manufacturing industry and the value of aviation training schools in preparing young men for jobs in the industry, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, through its aviation committee, has made a comprehensive survey of the field.

During this survey, the personnel heads of the five major manufacturers in the county were consulted. In arriving at conclusions, their statements were given major importance in the belief that the manufacturers themselves are in the best position to know the personnel requirements of the industry and the need for the aircraft training schools. Based on this primary source, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. A distinct differentiation must be made between vocational and job-training courses. A vocational training course is one requiring from a 10-month minimum to a 4-year maximum for completion. It provides training in a broad range of skills, and includes instruction in related technical subjects such as trade mathematics and drafting. The job-training course, of from 6 weeks to 3 months duration, is designed to teach the student how to perform a single job, such as riveting, welding, or sheet metal assembly.

2. The employee who has received a general vocational education is readily adaptable to many different jobs and, therefore, has a good expectancy for steady employment within the industry because he can be transferred from one department to another if necessary. The job-trained employee is comparatively insecure because his brief and restricted training equips him to do only one job and when production schedules require curtailment in his particular field, he is not equipped for transfer to another department.

3. There is absolutely no connection between the aircraft manufacturers and the private training schools and there is no agreement either implied or stated that the manufacturers will employ their graduates. Employment selections are made solely on the basis of merit, irrespective of the individual's former connections. In addition to mechanical knowledge and skill, there are usually other qualifications that are considered, such as personality traits, physical fitness, citizenship and in some instances the satisfactory passing of general intelligence, temperament, mechanical aptitude and other selective tests.

4. The employee who is trained as a skilled mechanic with several years of classroom and shop instruction has greater opportunity for advancement to supervisorial and foremen's jobs than the job-trained employee. Promotions are, of course, dependent upon other qualities of leadership.

5. The major aircraft manufacturers are unanimous in their opinion that there is no current need on the part of the industry for aviation schools of the job-training type and anticipate no future need for them. When the industry first began extensive hiring, the training offered by these schools was of some value, but there is now an abundance of job-trained and semi-skilled workers in southern California. The manufacturers are emphatic in their warning that with the two exceptions of graduate engineers and skilled craftsmen, there is an abundant local labor supply and the California aircraft industry offers no employment opportunity to out-of-State applicants. It is believed by the industry that should a future emergency again require extensive hiring, the companies could and would conduct their own training program with greater effectiveness and less cost to the student than would be possible by private schools.

6. Some of the public schools offer adequate courses in mechanic training and is suggested that those interested in this field should consult the vocational educational departments of their local public school systems. The Civil Aeronautics Authority, Washington, D. C., issues a list of private schools to which it has issued letters of recognition indicating that their credits are acceptable for application toward a Civil Aeronautics Authority Airplane Mechanic's Certificate. It should be pointed out, however, that this C. A. A. approval is given with primary reference to their capacity for training mechanics for the inspection, maintenance, overhaul or repair of aircraft, engines, propellers, and appliances rather than for the actual manufacturing processes.

MARCH 28, 1940.

Testimony of Robert B. Robertson—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Robertson, in your recruiting experience, is there any particular part of the country that you get the greatest number from?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we have found that the Middle West—Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan—there seems to be a concentration of skill in those particular States.

The CHAIRMAN. Any farm boys?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. We don't bring anyone out unless they are highly skilled craftsmen; tool makers, die makers, or machinists.

The CHAIRMAN. We are trying to tie up the migrant problem, don't you see?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I don't believe our recruiting activities would have very much bearing on the migrant problem because if something should happen that a man we bring out, a skilled man, should not stay with Lockheed, why, he could go the next day and get a job at some other plant.

INSUFFICIENT SKILLED LABOR

The CHAIRMAN. What do you consider a No. 1 recruit?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I don't know as I understand exactly what you mean.

The CHAIRMAN. His qualifications?

Mr. ROBERTSON. A man with 8 to 10 or 12 years' experience in a skilled trade who, in all probability, has gone through an apprenticeship before that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Where is he going to get that 8 or 10 years' experience?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, as far as we are concerned, he has already had it in the machine-tool industry and other metal trade industries back in the Middle West.

The CHAIRMAN. The problem that I am thinking of, and the way that it might fit into this picture with the migrant problem—take those areas where we have a surplus of population or where we have a surplus of farm population, due either to high birth rates, low economic opportunities, or due to the Dust Bowl or whatever it might be, suppose some kind of a training program were developed there in order that those young men might train to become skilled workers—the thought is how are they going to get that experience that is required by the aviation industry unless there is some intermediate industry that can pick them up and give it to them?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, of course, we are faced with this problem. We are faced with the problem of taking highly skilled men and stepping them up the line in the organization and taking the people that we might term as semiskilled, or specialists in certain machines as replacements. In other words, we have to spread the skill a little thin and we realize that we have to do that even though the labor organizations say that there is an abundance of skill. If there is, we haven't found it.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Robertson, I have questioned several witnesses on this particular point in different parts of the country. Do you feel that there is something missing and something wrong with our educational system, our public educational system, because of the fact we are not turning out young people in the vocational lines?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we are talking about two different things, I think. When we talk about skill we are talking about a man that can be made skillful in 6 months or a year.

Mr. OSMERS. Changing the subject from that, I am talking about your average employee that you say comes out of a pretty good school and that you can use with a little added training, the man whom you can use in your plant.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we are working very closely with the defense program training and we have got some pretty good boys out of those schools already.

Mr. OSMERS. But, Mr. Robertson, with all due respect to the defense training schools, I am talking about the educational policy of America for the past 150 years.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, you want to know——

Mr. OSMERS (interrupting). Are we turning out a lot of white-collar people when there aren't a lot of white-collar jobs?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think we have for the past 10 years. I think we have lost one generation in that line. I really do.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, there is an absence of teaching young men how to use their hands?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right. I think we are beginning to realize now that we have lost about one generation or about 10 years.

Mr. OSMERS. Certainly anyone in any industrial activity realizes that. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Robertson, for giving us your time. It was a very valuable contribution to us.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. and Mrs. Higgenbottom.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS BENJAMIN HARRISON HIGGENBOTTOM, MRS. MAUDE HIGGENBOTTOM, MISS JUNE HIGGENBOTTOM, MISS MARY HIGGENBOTTOM, AND DALE HIGGENBOTTOM, OF FRESNO, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Higgenbottom, will you give your name?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Thomas Benjamin Harrison Higgenbottom.

The CHAIRMAN. And where do you live?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Fresno.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say to you folks that we have been all over the country and that you do not need to be afraid of this committee. We have met a lot of so-called migrants and you look just as good to us as the governors and mayors and everybody else, so we want you to tell about your experiences, and just relax and don't worry about us. You will not be asked any sharp questions or anything of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

JUNE HIGGENBOTTOM. June.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you, June?

JUNE HIGGENBOTTOM. Eleven.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your name?

MARY HIGGENBOTTOM. Mary.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

MARY HIGGENBOTTOM. Fourteen.

The CHAIRMAN. What about you, son?

DALE HIGGENBOTTOM. Dale.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

DALE HIGGENBOTTOM. Eight.

The CHAIRMAN. How many more children have you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We have four more living.

The CHAIRMAN. Four living. That is seven altogether that are living?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The Chairman. And how many children did you have?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Eight.

The Chairman. And what did you do after you got married? Live on a farm?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. What kind of a farm was it?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Just a general farm—cotton corn, oats, and such as that.

The Chairman. Did you buy the farm?

Mr. Higgenbottom. No; leased from an Indian.

The Chairman. How much money did you pay for it; that is, lease money?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Two hundred and something a year. Then I did some building on it and cleaned up quite a little land.

The Chairman. Was your father a farmer ahead of you, before you?

Mr. Higgenbottom. He was also a farmer.

The Chairman. Well, how long did you remain on that farm?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Let's see—I taken the habit of cleaning up land in Oklahoma at that time. It was new, you know, and would sell out the leases; work a bunch in winter, you know, and sell the leases for the profit that was in it. Sometimes made a profit and sometimes I lose a little, but then generally I tried to make a profit.

The Chairman. Yes, that is a normal idea.

Mr. Higgenbottom. I stayed—I followed that for 5 or 6 years until that section was cleaned up. It developed awfully quick when it first started there, to about 1916 or 1917, why then it very nearly all went into cultivation.

The Chairman. Is that the eastern or the western part of Oklahoma?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, it is approximately called the central-eastern. It is in the Indian Territory.

The Chairman. Did you make any money on that farm?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, I don't know. We made a living. We did fairly well. We couldn't complain.

The Chairman. And when did you leave that farm?

Mr. Higgenbottom. I left it the first year. I sold it out after I cleaned it up and built a house and built the fencing; some fellows moved in from Arkansas and I sold out to them in one day. I think I got $1,800.

The Chairman. Cash?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Cash money.

The Chairman. Then where did you go?

Mr. Higgenbottom. We rented a farm over by what is known as Slick, part of the ground that Slick is on; the town where the oil fields are. It is the oil town, Slick.

The Chairman. How did you make out there?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, we did fairly good. We had taken what is known in our country as malaria fever and chills. It developed pretty much over the country at that time, on account of the rains.

The Chairman. You have had a good many chills since, after you started to move, haven't you?

Mr. Higgenbottom. I believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. Well now, Mr. Higgenbottom, how long did you remain there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We stayed 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make any money there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes; we made a little money. We got ahead. We accumulated quite a little stuff around us—generally a farmer does—and we moved from there to another farm about 5 miles from there that belonged to a banker. We did extra good there. We hit a good crop.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to tell me you made a little money from the banker?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No; not the banker.

The CHAIRMAN. But you got a good deal, did you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I cleaned up quite a little land for him. It was good land in the river bottom. He hadn't had it developed yet, so I went in there and we cleaned it up. We made a pretty good crop.

From there we moved to Kansas where her folks lived. We had taken—we rented a farm there of about 640 acres. It was mostly in alfalfa and in grass, and raised two or three hundred acres of crop. We stayed 1 year.

There was a bunch of wheat growers come in from the west. At that time the war was on pretty good, you know, and so we sold out, sold our stock and went back to Oklahoma. I figured we could do better there, knew our country. We rented a farm down close to Muskogee. We did fairly good. We made a good crop, I guess about the best crop there was in the neighborhood at that time; corn and cotton.

Then we moved close to Tahlequah, Okla. We stayed there on that farm 2 years and it wasn't large enough, so I moved to another farm and bought a farm at the same time.

We moved about a mile and we didn't do quite so good that year, but on our own land we had quite a bunch of cattle. That was about in 1920.

We had a free range and we bought quite a bunch of cattle and had them around. It cost us $100 apiece, and there is where the drought caught us with those cattle. Lots of people say if I could look forward as I do backward—those cattle brought me $10 apiece and I give a hundred for them. Of course, I had a little mortgage on some of them and to quiet the mortgage I just sold enough to lack a little of paying the mortgage. I owed a little land note and I didn't have money enough, so I sold two hounds for $165.

The CHAIRMAN. Two what?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Two hounds; running hounds.

The CHAIRMAN. They must have been fast.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, I sold them for $165. I sold 16 head of cattle for $160, but two hounds brought $165.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you go into the hound business then?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, I did. Just about that time, the time I got into the hound business, the Osage Indians, they didn't have any money to spend. Oil went down.

The CHAIRMAN. The hounds went with them?

Mr. Higgenbottom. So they quit buying hounds. Hounds like I sold were selling for $10 apiece, and I give some of them away that I raised.

The Chairman. What were they? Just rabbit chasers?

Mr. Higgenbottom. No; wolfhounds; fetch wolves. They were running hounds with a pedigree; just a breed of hounds.

The Chairman. What kind of wolves were there there, timber wolves?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Timber wolves and coyotes.

The Chairman. Go ahead.

Mr. Higgenbottom. We stayed there about 5 years on that farm and we sold it. We moved on a larger farm about 2 miles from there, in the same school district the other farm was in. We put in quite a bunch of—quite a crop, I guess about the largest one there was in the country, and I guess the best. I guess the best and biggest there was in the country. I stayed on that place 4 years.

I think I had taken about $1,000 cash on the farm and the last year I was on it, I had 27 head of cattle when we left and I was in debt $500 and I left with three mules and a pony and no cattle at all.

The Chairman. Don't forget the wife and children.

Mr. Higgenbottom. Of course, all this time, why, I was accumulating a little larger family.

The Chairman. Well, I would say you had made a good showing with your accumulation, all right.

Mr. Higgenbottom. It had taken. I am a great hand, you know.

Now this boy here—we left Oklahoma 3 years ago, and as young as he is, I put him out with a mule, running out in the cotton, and I put them all out; these girls, both of them. All of them, you see, I start pretty young to farming so if I get behind or something, why I let them do the work and they can all handle mules.

The Chairman. You manage to work the wife a little, too, don't you?

Mr. Higgenbottom. She is generally busy at the house. If dinner wasn't ready, you know what takes place.

We moved from there and we went about 30 miles west from there to Wagoner County, and then we started farming there. At the first year I had taken $500 worth of debts and moved them over to this bank, from one bank to the other, like we generally do when we move; transfer our debts to the other county.

The Chairman. That is a new one on me. You go to one bank and pick up your debt and transfer it to another bank?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Yes.

The Chairman. Did you have any trouble doing that?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, not too much. There is a whole lot to the person. You know the record generally follows a fellow, if he pays his debts.

The Chairman. And it depends on the sort of a front you put up, too, doesn't it?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, I don't know. I talked just as good as I ever did, the last few years, but it doesn't go anywhere.

The Chairman. Then go on from there.

Mr. Higgenbottom. We made a crop that year; made a pretty good cotton crop and corn crop. Everything was fairly good. The lightning killed two of my mules in one night. There come up a little thunderstorm. Then it was not very long until there was a little cyclone hit through there—didn't hit quite at our place, but it hit—and we had a good horse, about as good as there was in the country, I guess, and he run into—he got excited and run into a tree and broke his neck. That left us with one mule.

Well then, I went to buying what is called scrub stock for $10 and $15, you see. I got down to where my credit wasn't good with the bank any more because I didn't have any security.

So along about that time the plow-up program come.

You see the reason that I always get the children to help me, we all work together. If I am out in the field, my shadow amounts to a whole lot out in the field. I always try to stay out with them, because maybe they get tangled up with the horses or something when they were working, but it is not long until they can go along.

Along about that time they come through with the cut on the cotton acreage. They cut the cotton acreage. On the farm I was farming, it was just adapted to cotton. That was a cash crop. You see, we farm corn, wheat, and oats just enough, you know, and we didn't want to get into it very large on account of it cost so much for machinery. I have the hands to handle the cotton, and it requires quite a little work.

Let us see, in '28 it was—I am going back—the reason I left over there was that I didn't make anything. It rained the entire year. Just before we moved to Wagoner it rained the entire year there. The corn was awfully good, and the wheat and the oats that I had, about 150 acres of wheat, and all that, were good; but the rain wouldn't let you get in the field and cut it. It just fell down. And the cotton, in the rainy season, the boll weevils worked awfully bad at that time. On 35 acres of cotton I finally picked out a bale of cotton. On 10 acres I never got a bloom on it on account of the weevils. But we had tended it good before we knew it wasn't going to make anything.

So I lost my wheat and other crops and the weevils ate up everything on it except the mortgage. I had a pretty good mortgage on it. The banker, he held the mortgage and was a little luckier. He had the mortgage in a safe place. That was the reason why I had taken and I sold my cattle. Then I moved to this Wagoner County, Okla.

So that was the year that my horses died. I stayed there on that place. In '33—I will go on up to the story where I was—in '33, I think it was along about that time, why I got a pretty good bunch of cotton hands. We could really go to town on it. We raised it and we generally had the finest flower garden in the country. The girls come in at noon and I had seen them, they would grab the hoe and go out and handle the flowers. We had the finest flower garden that I seen anywhere. In fact I made a trip to Indiana and back and I didn't see as nice a flower garden. The girls did that while they were resting at noon from hoeing cotton.

Along about 1933, I think it was, they had—you know, they called it the cotton reduction. Well, on this farm, why they cut my cotton. I generally raised about 40 or 45 acres of cotton and I put in for it, told them how much cotton I raised—the truth. I always got by the bank with the truth pretty well, found out it generally paid. But on this occasion, why there were several in the field, you know, that were in the country, and when the cotton acreage came out it was nearly twice as large as ever had been planted in the county. I seen then I was hooked. I wasn't a very good hand to stay in the game or I wasn't a good liar. Well, when they come through, they caught the fellow that told the truth and they cut his acreage down, which had taken mine down half or very near half. Then they give it another reduction. But many fellows in there, probably that maybe planted 4 or 5 acres of cotton said they had planted 50 and 100, because they seen what the Government pay-off was, and everything, saw that it was a paying proposition, and they wanted lots of cotton. You see, there was no check-up that was given, much.

The Chairman. Anyway, you didn't make it go there, is that right? I am kind of anxious to get you started toward California if I can. I want you to tell me why you are in California.

Mr. Higgenbottom. So when the cotton acreage was cut, my children—I finally landed with 16 acres of cotton, with a big family that could do the work, you know, on approximately 40 or 50 acres of cotton, and do the other work growing the living, which we had to have—I can raise cotton a lot cheaper than you can if you hire the work done on that basis. I did that in order to keep my children at home and, of course, if I was going out here and hire a lot of work done, on the cotton, I wouldn't go at it that way. But in order to keep my children to home, I can work them at home and they would all be at home and we could raise largely our own living, but it takes some money.

The cotton acreage was cut and a couple of the older children says there is no use of staying there. "We will go hunt us a job." Of course, that throwed a little extra labor on the market, as two of them left home. But I always want to keep my children home. They have never been back since they left, since they left home. They stayed away. One of them went to Arizona to pick cotton and stayed his 6 months and came back for a little while but no more. There wasn't no work at home because we could handle the 16 acres of cotton just, you might say, a one man's job.

Then we moved from that place. We moved from there to another place about 5 miles from there.

The Chairman. In Oklahoma?

Mr. Higgenbottom. In Oklahoma. The first year—it was '36—it was the drought all over the country. We didn't make anything. We had a few potatoes. We made quite a crop of potatoes. They were a fairly good price and would keep us from starving to death. In the fall we hooked up the truck and went to Texas to pick cotton. We left the family there to do the work and we left quite a little canned stuff and fruit and they had milk and butter and everything. We come back and we were hunting location. That is what we were hunting. We want to get somewhere where we might farm. We didn't want to sell our crop or teams and stuff, so we went to Texas and we picked cotton. Texas was somewhat of a failure, too. We didn't make too good. We made our expenses and come back. Not any better off than when we left.

So in '37—'36 and '37—why we made nothing.

That winter—we generally keep quite a bunch of chickens and milk cows and hogs around—we come back and we started in to make another crop and I put in for the F. S. A. loan. I went to Muskogee and I got a producer's loan. I already had that on this crop, you know, and it didn't pay off anything so I had to get an F. S. A. loan for feeding.

Well, there was nothing made. The chickens, along in January and February—it was awfully cold—we lost, I guess, two or three hundred chickens that starved to death. You could go out and see them. We lost one mule, one cow, just on starvation. You know that don't look good to a farmer, so I made up my mind then that it was—we got our F. S. A. loan after we got most of our crop planted and it was a big help when we got it, of course, but we didn't get it in time. If I could have got that loan to have bought feed, you know, the 1st of January, I could have put the chickens to producing and went on. But everything went against me.

So I says, "Well, now, this is our last crop. I will never see anything else that I have got starve to death."

The CHAIRMAN. So you left there?

DESCRIPTION OF MIGRATION FROM OKLAHOMA TO CALIFORNIA

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I made that crop and sold out, paid up—I don't owe no banks—paid the F. S. A. loan off and paid the producer's loan off, and it left me a few dollars, and I loaded in just a little stuff one morning and we took a notion to leave.

The CHAIRMAN. How many children did you have at that time?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We had five with us at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a car did you have?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. An A model. It was about '29. It wasn't a new one.

The CHAIRMAN. No, it wasn't new. It was in '37 when you used it and it was a '29. It wasn't exactly new; was it?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No.

The CHAIRMAN. So you loaded up the wife and the five children in the car, and at that time did you know where you were going?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, we heard of Gilbert, Ariz. That it was a good cotton country.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you hear about that?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. My boy had come back and told me they was quite a lot of cotton there.

The CHAIRMAN. But at that time you didn't intend to go to California; did you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No; we went to Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. How much money did you have when you left?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I don't know. It was forty-some-odd dollars I think.

The CHAIRMAN. You were still pretty rich?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Eight of us rode in what is called a roadster, A model. It was pretty well crowded. I have seen lots of them and wondered how—it was cold weather, as it was in December.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you get along? Do you know the route that you took? What route did you take?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We went on 66 I think to Amarillo and there—where did we go?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the famous old highway?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We come down through—I forget the towns.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would you sleep at night?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We generally get tourist cabins, cost 75 cents or $1.

The CHAIRMAN. Your $40 was getting a little lower all the time, wasn't it, I suppose?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any trouble at the State lines?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, not on that trip, no. We didn't have any trouble.

1. COTTON PICKING IN ARIZONA

The CHAIRMAN. Did you go right into Arizona then?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes, about 27 miles southeast of Phoenix.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you live there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We lived there in a tourist camp and picked cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the children help you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes. We started in picking cotton. The cotton picking was pretty well over with. We would make $4 a day. I was a pretty good cotton picker, but the cotton was pretty well over.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you work at $4 a day?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Until the first of 1938, wasn't it?

Mrs. HIGGENBOTTOM. The first of 1938.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. The first day of 1938. Then I got on a job on a dam at Mormon Flat. I went up there and I landed that job. I worked and I was the last man off of it. All of them was laid off one day and I went back and worked the next day to inspect things with the superintendent and was there.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, when did you leave that place in Arizona?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I left in July and went to Eloy, Ariz.

The CHAIRMAN. And all the time you lived in these tourist camps?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay for it, did you say?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. $8 a month; $8 and $10.

The CHAIRMAN. You carried your bedding, of course, with you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes. It was a mighty filthy camp. We didn't want to stay, but conditions—the money didn't let us.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you go from there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We went to Eloy, Ariz.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Picked cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We was there 3 or 4 months, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you live there?

2. LIVING CONDITIONS IN COTTON CAMP

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We lived in a cotton camp, in tents on the ground, you know. We had a 12 by 14 tent.

The CHAIRMAN. And the eight of you lived in that tent?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it cold?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, it wasn't so cold. It was dusty, you know. That dust—we would have to carry water and sprinkle down on the ground to keep the dust from rising, and then the wind would sometimes blow the tents over. But we fixed ours pretty solid.

The Chairman. You had to carry your water, you say?

Mr. Higgenbottom. Well, yes, sir; a couple of hundred yards. The reason we did that, in order to keep from being in the main camp where probably there was two or three hundred Mexicans and Negroes, all lived side by side in there—two or three families moved out on the desert. We had to carry water.

The Chairman. I suppose you had the latest sanitary appliances in those tents, toilet facilities and everything?

Mr. Higgenbottom. They was the earliest, I think. There was lots of brush down through the country. If we wanted to change clothes, and if there was anybody around, we had to go down there—if we wanted to go to town or anywhere—we would go over down by the brush there and change clothes and come back and go to town.

The Chairman. How long were you there, Mr. Higgenbottom?

Mr. Higgenbottom. We were there until in January. We was there when they quarantined us for smallpox.

You see, the smallpox come through there and we could walk around in the field, you know. This fellow was quite a cotton farmer, and my bunch was vaccinated—or that is, we thought they were all vaccinated from smallpox at Gilbert, in the schools, and so we had these smallpoxes. They would come out in the field. They was just as scabby as goats, you know, picking the cotton. The people would tell the health officers.

Well, the fellow had his way for getting rid of those kind of fellows. It was to fire them. When they would break out with smallpox he would fire them. He couldn't use them any longer. That would keep him from losing his cotton camp.

Well, they would go over to some other cotton camp. Finally I kept this girl here from school. She was—her head, you might say, was a solid scab; just broke out with smallpox, and here comes the school fellow, you know, "You got to send her to school in the morning. You see that she is in school."

We were keeping them out of school once in a while to pick cotton, and I don't blame him for kind of kicking up a fuss. We would have to get up the grocery bill. Some days we got to do work and sometimes we wouldn't.

He was gone about an hour or 2 hours and here the health officer brought her back. "You keep that girl from school. Why didn't you keep her out? You have had the whole school quarantined over here."

Well, I said, "That is too bad." They quarantined the camp then over this. We was under quarantine 21 days and they fed us.

The way they issued groceries there, the fellow that was "abatching" in a tent, he got just as many groceries as a fellow with 15. Everyone got so much. We got about enough to maybe get a meal if we could eat it. I know we got some bacon one time—they was pretty liberal with us, they gave us some bacon—and we boiled it with beans. We couldn't eat it any other way. We thought it would season the beans, which it did. We went to cut it and you could stick a fork in it and push it out over the plate. We figured it wasn't much to eat so we threw it out. The wolves would come up within 20 feet of your tent and howl of a night. We always figured they——

The CHAIRMAN (interrupting). You missed the hounds then, I suppose?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We missed the hounds, but I wouldn't have fed that to the hounds, I don't believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Now I am sorry, Mr. Higgenbottom; I have got to hurry you along. We have a lot of witnesses here. Now tell me when did you leave there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We left—we went to the Avondale camp, what was called the Avondale cotton camp. We stayed there 2 weeks and we was picking cotton and one morning we woke up and looked—it was a tin shack and awful floors—it was just dirt, you know—and my wife she looked through into the next room, through some holes through the tin, you know, and there was a woman picking lice off her children, so we loaded right away and got out as quick as we could get out, and headed for Arizona.

Mrs. HIGGENBOTTOM. To California.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We came to California. They had the police officers over here at "Calpat." We went in a Government camp there at "Calpat."

3. FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CAMP

The CHAIRMAN. You mean a Farm Security camp?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes, a Farm Security camp; emergency tent camp.

The CHAIRMAN. You had nothing but tents there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Tents was all we had there.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that a little better lay-out than the one you left?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes. We had showers. We had everything that was kept clean. There wasn't no papers blowing around and everything was just kept clean.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay there for that?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Didn't cost nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you stay there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We stayed there until it moved, and then we moved with it to Beaumont, Calif.

We didn't make any picking peas because I have seen 1,500 in one field and each one would get a hamper of peas and leave. I have seen them fight over rows, they wanted to pick peas so bad.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you get for picking peas?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, when we first went there they was giving $1.25 but in a little while they cut it down to $1. They figured they couldn't pay any more. Peas was only 16 cents a pound.

Then we went to Beaumont and picked cherries there, and lived in the Government camp there. From there we went to Thornton, Calif., up north here. We found very little work there. The Filipinos were doing the most of the work there in the tomatoes. We worked a little in hay and then we went to San Jose and worked in the apricots. Then we went back to Thornton and thought we would work in the tomatoes, but the Filipinos and the Japanese got all the good tomatoes, which I guess they know how a little more than the average fellow. Then we went to Visalia and worked a while and then back to "Calpat." I worked in a hamper mill last winter. Then we go back to Thornton and we are here a while and then we go back and are working at Thornton.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you at Thornton now?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No. We just left there. We moved.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you live at Thornton?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. In a Government camp.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you like it?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, the Government camp is far ahead of any outside camp, you know. You have got it sanitary. It is not desirable on account of the children, you know—moving around—the schools are not—you have got to move the children out of schools and they lose a certain interest. Then we moved down on a farm.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, before you leave that camp, did you pay anything per day?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We gave 25 cents a week to the fund to the camp, to keep things agoing.

The CHAIRMAN. Who handles that money?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Why, it is handled by a committee in the camp.

The CHAIRMAN. They elect a committee?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. A counselor. It is for—maybe they will have ice cream or something like that, and different things.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the only actual money that you were out, was the 25 cents a week?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you were permitted to go out and work, weren't you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And where are you living now?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I am on a farm 5 miles north of Fresno; on a small farm.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you buy it?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No. I haven't bought it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you trying to buy it?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I am figuring on trying to stay there another year and farm.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a house have you got?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. It is a two-room house. It is not the best, but then it is better than camps.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you or your wife ever been on relief?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. We have this year. We have got groceries twice, I think, on relief. We was forced to get them at "Calpat" last winter, and then when I went to Thornton I went and got them.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only time?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes. We was on relief last summer two or three different times—maybe more—to get groceries.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any trouble getting these groceries or money on account of not being a resident of California?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No. That was the F. S. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The F. S. A. Oh, yes.

You never applied for relief to the State of California or Arizona, did you?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And so what started you off from Oklahoma was that you just made up your mind that you couldn't make it go there? That is the idea?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, it was useless to stay there, you know.

The CHAIRMAN. And the climate of California—you didn't know or didn't hear anything about that, did you, before you started?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. No.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Higgenbottom, when did you first arrive in California? I missed that as I was out of the room.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. The 12th of February 1939.

Mr. OSMERS. That was the first time you ever came to California?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. OSMERS. I would like to ask one other question: Have you ever used a California State Employment Service, the employment offices where you apply when you are out of a job?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes, sir; I tried to use them.

Mr. OSMERS. You tried to use them? Why weren't you successful in using them?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Now last spring I had got registered in Beaumont. I went to the employment agent there at El Centro. One has to be put on the list as a combine man, which I am, a farmer, and I understand machinery, farming machinery. He told me, he says, "We can't register you. We keep this for home people," and which he was right, I guess. But I got a job on a combine there and worked.

Mr. OSMERS. This was in Beaumont, Calif.?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. This was in El Centro.

Mr. OSMERS. He would not accept your application as a combine worker, though you are a competent combine worker?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. OSMERS. Now the reason I asked that question was this: You told the committee that on several occasions you would go to different areas in search of employment and when you got there there was no work. I think you mentioned that the Filipinos had all the work and there wasn't any there. I was wondering if you had used a California State Employment Service whether you could have avoided that. They might have records in their office—I don't know whether they do—but they might have records that would have told you whether there was any pea picking or tomato picking in the different places that you went to.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. At one time we used the employment office at San Jose to go out on a job, but it proved worthless, you know. The employment offices in some cases are used, you know, in order to get a fellow out on jobs that are worthless. That is the way.

Mr. OSMERS. I am talking about public employment offices now. I am not talking about those people who make a charge or something like that, because they would have some interest in getting you out.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. This was in a public employment service. Of course, they didn't know what kind of a job that we would get out on, but it was planned to be—it proved to be worthless as far as money-making was concerned.

Mr. OSMERS. Was the money you made on the job less than they led you to believe it was going to be?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, I don't know as it was. The job——

Mr. OSMERS (interrupting). I am trying to get the facts. I want to clear them or involve them, one or the other.

Did they misrepresent it, or didn't they?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, I don't know. I wouldn't say.

Mr. OSMERS. You wouldn't say that they had misrepresented it?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I wouldn't say.

Mr. OSMERS. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was the employment office at San Jose?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the only experience you have ever had such as that?

Mr. OSMERS. He had one other experience with an employment agency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Higgenbottom, are you glad you came to California?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to go back home to Oklahoma?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, no; I don't believe I do. I have better health here than I had back there.

The CHAIRMAN. You have better health?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The children are all well, are they?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they all going to school?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Three of them are.

The CHAIRMAN. Well now, if you had a farm and could make it go back in Oklahoma, would you try to live there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I don't know. We have had so many failures I would be afraid to risk it again.

The CHAIRMAN. There comes a time when people down there in the dust bowl area can't make it go, and rather than starve standing still they get out and move? Don't you think that is the idea?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anything else that you have in mind that you haven't told us? I think you have covered it very well.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Higgenbottom, do you consider yourself a Californian today or an Oklahoman?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Well, I don't know. The California people have always treated me mighty nice. I will have to say that.

Mr. OSMERS. Then you would consider yourself a Californian?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. OSMERS. I think that a great many Californians misuse the word "migrant". I think that it should be "immigrant" and not "migrant" because most of the people that come here expect to stay. Isn't that true, as to those that you have met working around?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. I think there is a large percent of them that intend to stay. You see, the wages in Oklahoma—they are so scarce and there is so little, you know, 50 cents a day there is about the wage scale on the farm. You could put up a sign on a post—I did on potato picking—at 75 cents a day, and I think there was 100 come and I only needed 20. I didn't think about getting the whole country in; 75 cents a day to pick up potatoes, and they pick cotton at 15 cents a hundred, which is generally the scale of wages.

Mr. OSMERS. You mean back there?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. OSMERS. And here?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Here it is 85. You see, probably the cheaper wages there drives people out. Now, I know that has a tendency, to make money, you know, if you can get the work done for nothing, why of course you can afford to farm. That has caused a lot of farmers to develop their acreage, the large farms, to develop their acreage.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the census figure in the last 10 years, a million people have moved out of the Great Plains States, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas. We have had testimony introduced in hearings at Oklahoma and Lincoln, Nebr., by experts showing that 5,000,000 acres of land in the Great Plains States have 25 percent of the topsoil gone.

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. TOLAN. You believe that?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes. It is fully that much.

Mr. TOLAN. In other words the soil in some of those Southern States isn't getting any more fertile and it is just going the other way, isn't it?

Mr. HIGGENBOTTOM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Higgenbottom, we thank you, and you, too, Mrs. Higgenbottom. You are a pretty fine family, and I am proud of you because we have heard a lot of eastern families testify and I think you are right up with the best of them. I hope you have a lot of good luck with the family and that you make your farming stick. Thank you very much.

(Witnesses excused.)

Chairman TOLAN. Mr. Snyder.

TESTIMONY OF RALPH SNYDER, BELLFLOWER, CALIF.

Mr. OSMERS. What is your full name, Mr. Snyder?

Mr. SNYDER. Ralph Snyder.

Mr. OSMERS. Where were you born?

Mr. SNYDER. Slayton, Minn.

Mr. OSMERS. How old are you?

Mr. SNYDER. Twenty-nine.

Mr. OSMERS. What education have you had, Mr. Snyder?

Mr. SNYDER. Grade school and high school and 6 months' business college.

Mr. OSMERS. You are a high-school graduate and you spent 6 months in business school?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. OSMERS. Are you married?

Mr. SNYDER. No.

Mr. Osmers. How many members are in your immediate family?

Mr. Snyder. Five and my mother and father; five children.

Mr. Osmers. Do they still live in Minnesota?

Mr. Snyder. Bellflower, Calif.

Mr. Osmers. Bellflower, Calif.? Do you live with them?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. What have you done since you got out of school?

Mr. Snyder. Well, I was raised on a farm and I have worked for construction companies; worked in a paint store, and I am at present working for the Pioneer Paper Co.

Mr. Osmers. What are you doing there?

Mr. Snyder. Working in the shipping department.

Mr. Osmers. Have you, in the course of your experience since you left school, ever used anything that you learned in school?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. What part of your education was useful to you?

Mr. Snyder. Well, my high-school education and business college.

The Chairman. A little louder.

Mr. Snyder. High school and business college, mathematics.

Mr. Osmers. Did you derive more from your time in business college than you did from your high-school course?

Mr. Snyder. Well, no. I had bookkeeping in high school and I took it up in business college.

Mr. Osmers. This business college that you attended was a private institution?

Mr. Snyder. It was the Nettleton in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Mr. Osmers. Did you pay any tuition to go there?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. Now, when did you come to California?

Mr. Snyder. January 18 last year—this year.

Mr. Osmers. This year?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. How did you come to California?

Mr. Snyder. Well, I was up in Minneapolis and I happened to get in touch with a salesman for this aviation training—this training school.

Mr. Osmers. You saw an advertisement?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. Where is this school located that he represented?

Mr. Snyder. Well, it was on Figueroa—it was 1823 Hope, in Los Angeles.

Mr. Osmers. In Los Angeles?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. And you were in Minneapolis at that time?

Mr. Snyder. I had been up there. I was staying with my brother up there.

Mr. Osmers. Yes. Now, did you talk to this man?

Mr. Snyder. Well, when I came out here I went around to several schools, the Fletcher School at Santa Monica, and I talked to a couple of fellows that went through there. Of course, they gained employment. I went down to Santa Monica and I saw an ad in the paper—I think it was the Los Angeles Examiner or—no; it was the Van Nuys paper—I went down there.

Mr. Osmers. An advertisement for a school?

Mr. Snyder. Yes; an aviation training school. Dick M. Ward was the salesman.

Mr. Osmers. He offered you employment?

Mr. Snyder. He said, "You will start in at 75 cents an hour." I asked him about it, inquired into it.

I says, "Do you guarantee employment?"

Well, he didn't come right out. He says, "Yes," and he took my background and he said, "You will make a good employee."

So I went ahead and joined up.

Mr. Osmers. Well, how long a course was this?

Mr. Snyder. Well, I spent $300 for 7 weeks.

Mr. Osmers. Seven weeks?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. And what did they teach you?

Mr. Snyder. Well, some work, riveting, and layout work—sheet-metal layout work—and drilling. They said they had welding but there was no welding in the school. I went there and they never did give any courses in it.

Mr. Osmers. Now, how did you finance this whole operation, the trip here from Minneapolis and the school tuition?

Mr. Snyder. Well, I had $250 or $275 when I came out here.

Mr. Osmers. And what did this tuition cost?

Mr. Snyder. Well, it was $150 for the course, and I paid $75 down.

Mr. Osmers. And what did you do about the balance?

Mr. Snyder. Well, I still owe them a note for that.

Mr. Osmers. For $75? The other $75?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. Now, with what you have experienced since then, would you say that that course qualified you for a position as an aviation mechanic?

Mr. Snyder. No, I don't think so. It is just, you know, on the body type of an airplane, the fuselage.

Mr. Osmers. What have you done since finishing that course?[1]

Mr. Snyder. Well, I worked for a construction company at Bakersfield on pipeline work; oil-field work.

Mr. Osmers. Yes?

Mr. Snyder. And I have worked for E. W. Jackson down at Bellflower, Calif., at a chain store.

Mr. Osmers. Yes?

Mr. Snyder. I have helped put on roof, house roofing.

Mr. Osmers. You might say they are odd jobs?

Mr. Snyder. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. They weren't permanent positions?

Mr. Snyder. Well, at Bakersfield I worked a month, I think, on the pipeline.

Mr. Osmers. Will you tell the committee, Mr. Snyder, about the efforts that the school made to get you employment?

Mr. Snyder. Well, they said they were helping. They gave me a letter. I went out to Douglas and they took my fingerprints and told me—I filled out an application blank and they took my fingerprints. There was five of us who went out at the same time, four other fellows and me.

---

[1] See testimony of Robert B. Robertson, p. 2806 et seq.

Mr. OSMERS. From the same school?

Mr. SNYDER. From the same school. We filled out applications and they took our fingerprints. They told us they would call us when they needed us. Well, then, I went—I was going out to Vultee at that time—this school seemed to have or was in touch with Douglas, where they were sending their scholars.

Mr. OSMERS. Yes?

Mr. SNYDER. So I stayed away a couple of weeks and I went back out. You couldn't get to talk to the personnel man other than the one at the door. He asked if I had made an application in there and I said I had and he said, "Well, we will call you when we need you," just like that.

Mr. OSMERS. They never called you?

Mr. SNYDER. No.

Mr. OSMERS. Did they make any comment at all upon the school that you had attended, or has anyone since then expressed their opinion as to the value of the courses given there?

Mr. SNYDER. No. They never said anything.

Mr. OSMERS. Doesn't this school get after you for failure to pay the unpaid balance on your tuition?

Mr. SNYDER. No. The agreement was that I would have to be employed in an aviation factory.

Mr. OSMERS. I see.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sparkman?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Have you applied at other aviation companies?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; Lockheed and Vultee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You realize that you are not sufficiently skilled?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I wouldn't say I was sufficiently skilled. I never had a chance. I am out of practice now, of riveting. You see, they use air-pressure riveting guns and if a man doesn't study on it he is out of practice.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is all.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will take a 5-minute recess at this time.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, after which proceedings were resumed as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will please come to order.

Monsignor O'Dwyer, I understand you desire to make a statement? We will be glad to hear you, Monsignor.

TESTIMONY OF RT. REV. MSGR. THOMAS J. O'DWYER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PROBLEM OF TRANSIENT YOUTH

Monsignor O'DWYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have here a statement which I wish to submit to you, and for your information it has to deal with one phase of the problem which you are considering, and that problem is the problem of the transient boy.

Much has been written, as you know, in magazines and newspapers during the past 4 or 5 years regarding this problem. I have had experience with this problem since 1924. Our agency has conducted an institution that has cared for the transients in this community for several years, and I have here statistical data which I believe will be of interest to you and the members of your committee. It is based on our experiences over a period of several years.

We have had boys in our institution from every State in the Union, and others will testify before your committee today regarding other phases of this problem. I simply wish to bring to your attention just one aspect of the whole problem of migration and just want to quote one or two sentences which I have in this statement here. [Reading:]

> The transient boy and young man constitutes a problem of his own, and is not comparable to any other originating from mass migration. This is particularly true because of their youthfulness and inexperience, their courage and vivid imagination, coupled with a romantic wish for new experience. Reasons, ranging from the monotony in their home community and adventure in searching for employment and healthier climates, could be enumerated here but, in spite of these, today's child tramp is beginning his life as a vagrant. In the natural course of events he will finish it as a street beggar or a criminal. The experience boys derive from their travels is of little value; I have found little that is wholesome, and nothing that is permanently good.
>
> I need not point out to you the hazards and pitfalls in those sections of every metropolitan center, commonly known as "skid row," where the down-and-outer, the criminal, the degenerate, and the hopeless derelict congregate, leading not only lives of want and privation, but of hopelessness and defeat. These men are drifting, with no hope of becoming anchored and no chance of resuming their place in normal society. Boys in their 'teens are to be found among them, starting out on a life that can only lead to a bleak and bitter disappointment.
>
> It would be hard to estimate conservatively the number of boys on the road today. It is probably over 100,000. The highway still appears to have its usual number of hitch-hikers, and the freight trains carry a still larger number of boys. Hobo jungles are as noticeable and as numerous today as they were 10 years ago.
>
> The geographic movement of the migrants is still toward the west; this perhaps being encouraged by huge construction projects such as the Boulder, Grand Coulee, Shasta, and Parker Dams, to mention a few requiring a large number of men for several years. Those are either completed or nearing completion, and to take their place as a drawing card is the rapidly expanding aircraft industry and the current building boom in southern California.

Of course, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is to be remembered that the average age of the youthful migrant is approximately 17. He is immature and lacks the training which would qualify him for industrial jobs that might be open. It is true that the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. have helped in a large measure to reduce the number of boys on the road, and here I wish to compliment the administration of the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. for the outstanding service that both services have rendered to the Nation's youth.

These programs are limited to strictly relief families and, consequently, do not cover those boys who come from homes of low-income families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As to the treatment of the general problem, and the disposition of the individual's problem, I would recommend that boys be cared for separately from men; that they be given care and shelter in small units of not more than 100 in any one camp or shelter; that the emphasis of the program be on counseling and guidance, and reeducation for proper living, rather than on fire roads and fire breaks. While a boy's return to his legal residence is perhaps best in a majority of cases, provision should be made to rehabilitate those boys who have no homes or such homes that would be unfit. That a strong follow-up program be instituted, and that local facilities and social agencies be used whenever practical. That local advisory committees be formed, not only to interpret the program to the public, but actually to advise the local administrations on policies and matters pertaining to the individual's and the community's good, and finally a uniformity of the legal settlement laws of all of the States of the Union.

There is considerable statistical data attached to this statement, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the time you have given me to present these few remarks regarding one perhaps small part of this total problem which you are considering, but still, from the point of view of crime prevention, and reduction of juvenile delinquency, I think it a very important phase of the program and I trust that it will receive your consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say to you that the testimony so far adduced before this committee indicates that among the millions of these migrants, one third of them are children and it presents a unique problem. The committee considers it an honor to have you take the time to appear before us and we will introduce in the record, in full, your statement, and I think it will be a very valuable contribution, Monsignor.

(Witness excused.)

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

THE CATHOLIC WELFARE BUREAU OF THE
ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 24, 1940.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOLAN: During a recent conversation with Mr. J. W. Abbott, relative to public hearings of the House Committee on Interstate Migration to be held in Los Angeles on September 28, 1940, I was advised that plans have been made to secure several witnesses who, I feel, can deal with the subject quite adequately, with the possible exception of the migratory boy and young man. At that time I promised to submit a brief report in writing, which follows:

"At the outset let me say that the views expressed herein are drawn from my personal experience and close association with the problem of boy transiency for the past 15 years; also incorporated in this report are the opinions of the director of the Junipero Serra Boys' Club of Los Angeles, whose experience with this problem covers the past 8 years. I have also drawn heavily from the material and statistical data which is available at the club, as our organization has been dealing directly with this problem since 1924.

"I sincerely trust that this report will be accepted in its proper light, viz, a brief, frank, and realistic picture of the transient boy and the transient-boy problem as it exists today, and based solely upon experience. Certain recommendations are offered as to the problem's future treatment. These seem to be practical for our local situation and, consequently, may or may not be applicable to other localities. Appended to this report are several statistical tables which are self-explanatory. (See pp. ——.)

"While the number of boys who are cared for at the Junipero Serra Boys' Club each year is but a small percentage of the total number coming to southern California, it is felt that it reflects a representative cross-section of the total number on the road. In other words, their reasons for coming to southern California are probably the same as for those who go to New York, Florida, or elsewhere.

"This problem is not new to southern California; it has been recognized by civic and social welfare leaders for the past 20 years. Definite attempts have been made by a few individuals and a few organizations to meet this problem, but its vastness and the lack of community understanding and intensive support, along with the growing thought of its being a Federal responsibility, has greatly handicapped all local efforts.

"The transient boy and young man constitutes a problem of his own, and is not comparable to any other originating from mass migration. This is particularly true because of their youthfulness and inexperience, their courage and vivid imagination coupled with a romantic wish for new experience. Reasons, ranging from the monotony in their home community and adventure in searching for employment and healthier climates, could be enumerated here, but in spite of these today's child tramp is beginning his life as a vagrant. In the natural course of events he will finish it as a street beggar or a criminal. The experience boys derive from their travels is of little value; I have found little that is wholesome, and nothing that is permanently good.

"I need not point out to you the hazards and pitfalls in those sections of every metropolitan center, commonly known as 'skid row,' where the down-and-outer, the criminal, the degenerate, and the hopeless derelict congregate, leading not only lives of want and privation, but of hopelessness and defeat. These men are drifting, with no hope of becoming anchored and no chance of resuming their place in normal society. Boys in their 'teens are to be found among them, starting out on a life that can only lead to a bleak and bitter disappointment.

"It would be hard to estimate conservatively the number of boys on the road today. It is probably over 100,000. The highway still appears to have its usual number of hitch-hikers, and the freight trains carry a still larger number of boys. Hobo jungles are as noticeable and as numerous today as they were 10 years ago.

"The geographic movement of the migrants is still toward the West; this perhaps being encouraged by huge construction projects such as the Boulder, Grand Coulee, Shasta, and Parker Dams, to mention a few requiring a large number of men for several years. Those are either completed or nearing completion, and to take their place as a drawing card is the rapidly expanding aircraft industry and the current building boom in southern California.

"I see no particular reason for any sharp or marked reduction in this moving element of surplus labor though, perhaps, better employment conditions throughout the Nation, and the compulsory conscription of some of our youth, will provide for a small reduction in their numbers. It must be remembered that the average age of the youthful migrant is, approximately, 17. He has completed the ninth grade. His immaturity and lack of training will disqualify him for industrial jobs that may be open. It is true that the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps have helped in a large measure to reduce the number of boys on the road, but these programs are limited to strictly relief families and, consequently, do not cover those boys who come from homes of low-income families. Our experience indicates that approximately 60 percent of the boys on the road do not have serious economic problems in their own homes. Any major catastrophe such as crop failures, drought, industrial depressions, etc., will greatly increase the static load almost immediately, but these, of course, cannot be predicted.

"As to the treatment of the general problem, and the disposition of the individual's problem, I would recommend that boys be cared for separately from men; that they be given care and shelter in small units of not more than 100 in any one camp or shelter; that the emphasis of the program be on counseling and guidance, and reeducation for proper living rather than on fire roads and fire breaks. While a boy's return to his legal residence is perhaps best in a majority of cases, provision should be made to rehabilitate those boys who have no homes or such homes that would be unfit. That a strong follow-up program be instituted, and that local facilities and social agencies be used whenever practical. That local advisory committees be formed, not only to interpret the program to the public, but actually to advise the local administrations on policies and matters pertaining to the individual's and community's good, and finally, a uniformity of the legal settlement laws of all of the States of the Union."

Respectfully submitted.

Rt. Rev. Thomas J. O'Dwyer,
General Director of Charities.

(The tables referred to are as follows:)

State (Legal residence of transients)	Fiscal year 1940 (to Sept. 1—10 months)		
	Rural	Urban	Total
Alabama	1	4	5
Arizona	2	10	12
Arkansas	3	6	9
California	18	49	67
Colorado	8	7	15
Connecticut	1	4	5
Delaware		1	1
District of Columbia		2	2
Florida	2	3	5
Georgia	4	1	5
Idaho	1		1
Illinois	16	48	64
Indiana	2	5	7
Iowa	5	4	9
Kansas	4	3	7
Kentucky		3	3
Louisiana	1	2	3
Maine	1		1
Maryland	1	4	5
Massachusetts	9	7	16
Michigan	6	16	22
Minnesota	4	11	15
Mississippi	3		3
Missouri	9	17	26
Montana	2	1	3
Nebraska	1	4	5
Hawaii		1	1
Nevada	5	1	6
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	1	8	9
New Mexico	6	4	10
New York	7	46	53
North Carolina		3	3
North Dakota			
Ohio	4	16	20
Oklahoma	16	14	30
Oregon	5	5	10
Pennsylvania	7	31	38
Rhode Island		3	3
South Carolina	1		1
South Dakota			
Tennessee	2	6	8
Texas	15	36	51
Utah	4	5	9
Vermont			
Virginia	2	1	3
Washington	5	7	12
West Virginia	2		2
Wisconsin	5	6	11
Wyoming	1		1
Mexico	1	5	6
Canada	1	1	2
Puerto Rico	1		1
Sweden		1	1
Total	195	412	607

Distribution, by age:	
12 years	2. 0
13 years	13. 0
14 years	18. 0
15 years	67. 0
16 years	110. 0
17 years	156. 0

Distribution, by age—Continued.	
18 years	83. 0
19 years	69. 0
20 years	51. 0
21 years and over	38. 0
Average age (years)	17. 2

Distribution, by highest grade completed:

0 to 1 year	1. 0
1 year	1. 0
2 years	4. 0
3 years	3. 0
4 years	5. 0
5 years	15. 0
6 years	23. 0
7 years	49. 0
8 years	110. 0
9 years	108. 0

Distribution by highest grade completed—Continued.

10 years	127. 0
11 years	62. 0
12 years	86. 0
13 years	8. 0
14 years	4. 0
15 years	0
16 years	1. 0
Average grade (years)	9. 2

Social status:	
Full orphan	59
Half orphan and broken home	290
Normal	258
Religion:	
Catholic	228
Protestant	332
Jewish	29
None	18

State (Legal residence of transients)	Fiscal year 1939		
	Rural	Urban	Total
Alabama	1	1	2
Arizona	2	10	12
Arkansas	8	11	19
California	19	43	62
Colorado	9	12	21
Connecticut		4	4
Florida	4	3	7
Georgia	2	4	6
Idaho	1	1	2
Illinois	9	60	69
Indiana	5	6	11
Iowa	7	5	12
Kansas	4	6	10
Kentucky	7	6	13
Louisiana	5	1	6
Maine	1	1	2
Maryland		3	3
Massachusetts	7	9	16
Michigan	6	28	34
Minnesota	4	8	12
Mississippi	4		4
Missouri	17	16	33
Montana	1	4	5
Nebraska	2	13	15
Nevada	3	1	4
New Hampshire	1		1
New Jersey	3	6	9
New Mexico	10	2	12
New York	6	36	42
North Carolina	4		4
North Dakota	2	1	3
Ohio	7	36	43
Oklahoma	26	15	41
Oregon	3	2	6
Pennsylvania	12	27	39
Rhode Island		1	1
South Carolina	1	1	2
South Dakota	1		1
Tennessee	7	6	13
Texas	31	38	69
Utah	2	1	3
Vermont			
Virginia	3	1	4
Washington	1	8	9
West Virginia	3	4	7
Wisconsin	2	5	7
Wyoming	1		1
American Samoa		1	1
Canada		1	1
Colombia, S. A		1	1
Total	256	453	709

Distribution, by age:

13 years	5. 0
14 years	29. 0
15 years	56. 0
16 years	130. 0
17 years	187. 0
18 years	97. 0
19 years	86. 0
20 years	61. 0
21 years and over	58. 0
Average age (years)	17. 3

Distribution, by highest grade completed:

0 year	1. 0
1 year	2. 0
2 years	6. 0

Distribution by highest grade completed—Continued.

3 years	10. 0
4 years	12. 0
5 years	25. 0
6 years	35. 0
7 years	66. 0
8 years	119. 0
9 years	95. 0
10 years	157. 0
11 years	79. 0
12 years	90. 0
13 years	5. 0
14 years	4. 0
15 years	1. 0
16 years	2. 0
Average grade (years)	8. 9

Social status:

Full orphan	78
Half orphan and broken home	275
Normal	356

Religion:

Catholic	359
Protestant	397
Jewish	33
None	20

State (Legal residence of transients)	Fiscal year 1938		
	Rural	Urban	Total
Alabama	4	----	4
Arizona	10	13	23
Arkansas	21	6	27
California	20	37	57
Colorado	5	11	16
Connecticut	2	2	4
Delaware	----	1	1
District of Columbia	----	5	5
Florida	1	5	6
Georgia	7	4	11
Idaho	5	3	8
Illinois	6	52	58
Indiana	5	8	13
Iowa	7	7	14
Kansas	14	13	27
Kentucky	4	7	11
Louisiana	3	3	6
Maine	----	----	----
Maryland	2	3	5
Massachusetts	3	11	14
Michigan	6	18	24
Mississippi	3	1	4
Minnesota	8	2	10
Missouri	20	27	47
Montana	2	2	4
Nebraska	4	10	14
Nevada	2	2	4
New Hampshire	----	----	----
New Jersey	5	12	17
New Mexico	4	4	8
New York	5	46	51
North Carolina	4	1	5
North Dakota	1	----	1
Ohio	9	44	53
Oklahoma	29	17	46
Oregon	10	6	16
Pennsylvania	12	31	43
Rhode Island	----	1	1
South Carolina	1	1	2
South Dakota	----	----	----
Tennessee	7	3	10
Texas	30	64	95
Utah	3	1	4

State (Legal residence of transients)	Fiscal year 1938		
	Rural	Urban	Total
Vermont			
Virginia	3		3
Washington	9	6	15
West Virginia	3	2	5
Wisconsin	3	5	8
Wyoming	3	2	5
Mexico	1	1	2
Canada	2	1	3
Philippine Islands		1	1
Total	309	501	810

Distribution by age:

12 years	2
13 years	17
14 years	33
15 years	78
16 years	176
17 years	233
18 years	81
19 years	80
20 years	73
21 years over	35
Average age (years)	17. 2

Distribution by highest grade completed:

0 year	3
1 year	2
2 years	2
3 years	8
4 years	14
5 years	34
6 years	55
7 years	90
8 years	166
9 years	142
10 years	145
11 years	64
12 years	64
13 years	6
14 years	7
15 years	2
16 years	0
Average grade (years)	8. 4

The Chairman. Mr. Wagenet and Mr. Huxley.

TESTIMONY OF H. D. HUXLEY, CALIFORNIA DIRECTOR, FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE, UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, AND RICHARD G. WAGENET, DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, BOTH OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Chairman. Congressman Osmers, of New Jersey, will interrogate you gentlemen.

Mr. Osmers. Mr. Huxley, how long have you been associated with the Employment Service in California?

Mr. Huxley. About 4 years.

Mr. Osmers. About 4 years?

Mr. Huxley. Off and on; not all the time.

Mr. Osmers. I wonder if you would give to the committee, in your own words, a brief background of the history of the Employment Service in California, pointing out its good points and bad points as they have appeared to you, and a little bit about the structural set-up of it through these years that you have been with it.

Mr. Huxley. Without going into the organizational structure and without going into the increases——

The Chairman (interrupting). I don't want to interrupt you, but would you be kind enough to speak a little louder? I am rather proud of this California audience and I believe they would like to hear you.

Mr. HUXLEY. I don't think you wish me, Congressman, to go into the organization as it increased and the expansion and so forth?

Mr. OSMERS. Not particularly. We are interested more in its operations, frankly, and its success and failures.

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. HUXLEY. Well, as you probably know, with the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933, they started out with, I think, 12 offices in this State. The State put up a nominal amount of money—I have forgotten the exact amount—and the funds were supplemented by N. R. S. funds.

Mr. OSMERS. That is the National Reemployment Service?

Mr. HUXLEY. The National Reemployment Service. The service at that particular time, I would say, went through the normal growing pains of any service but did, I think, a reasonably good job in connection with agriculture.

Subsequently, with the expansion of the service under the Unemployment Compensation Act, and with the transfer of the service to the Unemployment Reserves Commission, as it was known at that time, the emphasis was placed not on employment service functions, naturally, but rather on unemployment compensation, with the result that there was not a normal expansion of the service commensurate with the increase in staff and increased financing made possible through the Social Security Board funds.

There were also obviously certain organizational difficulties. I think it should be borne in mind that when you have a new program to administer there are a great many untried phases in it. You don't quite know how to staff. I don't think there was enough staff. I think also that administratively there were a number of points of confusion, all of which mitigated against the proper operations, at least to the fullest extent, of the placement phases of the service. That condition persisted pretty much until, I would say, January and February of 1940.

At that time a reorganization was made effective in the whole department of employment. The emphasis was reversed from unemployment compensation and was laid on employment service aspects. Intermittently, during the years 1936 to 1938, the service did a good job; generally, though, there was no real progress made, I think, in any of those years in completely exploring the possibility of employment service.

Recently, in the development of the program, the emphasis has changed locally, perhaps, because of the fact that unemployment compensation has become rather standardized, and everyone knows more or less where they fit into the picture. The people in the local offices know what to do in a given situation. Formerly, naturally, it was untested and untried.

Does that give you what you wish?

Mr. OSMERS. It gives me a pretty good picture of it. I wonder if you would care to explain, in a little more detail, your statement that between 1936 and 1938 that the service—I forget the words that you used—did a spotty job.

Mr. HUXLEY. That is right. My own opinion is that during that time there was improper administration control at the top; there was too much latitude allowed in the local offices; there was not proper direction during that period of time; there was not, if you will, an objective approach to the entire problem and it was spotty in the sense that some local offices did a good job and other local offices did not do so good a job.

Mr. OSMERS. But, Mr. Huxley, in a situation such as California agriculture, where a great many of the workers move from place to to place, the fact that one office was doing a good job was of very little use if other offices along the line were not doing a good job, isn't that true?

Mr. HUXLEY. That is correct.

Mr. OSMERS. Your referral from place to place would break down?

Mr. HUXLEY. It should also be borne in mind at that time that there was no very great shortage of labor. It is questionable how much the employment service could have been used at that time. The whole migratory problem, I believe, was in a marked state of flux; no one quite knew where it was.

(The following statement on clearance for agricultural labor, between offices, was received later and accepted for the record:)

CLEARANCE

By regularly established procedures, an office in which unfilled job openings exist makes a direct request to adjacent offices, or those which might reasonably be able to fill the opening, for the referral of qualified applicants.

By this procedure, the headquarters clearance comes into play only when direct contacts between offices are not effective in filling the job openings.

For this reason, headquarters office records of clearance activities do not reflect the majority of the openings cleared between offices. With few exceptions, the headquarters clearance is not used for filling agricultural openings, since such openings are handled almost exclusively between the individual offices concerned. When the direct interoffice clearance is not sufficient, the headquarters office clearance is used for agricultural as well as for other openings.

An illustration of this is the referral of hop pickers to the Santa Rosa office. Headquarters clearance has been regularly used to aid in this problem. Between August 11 and August 25, 1939, 41 offices of the department referred 2,591 registered applicants to hop picking in the Santa Rosa area.

The department has been making intensified efforts to furnish to the personnel of all offices, information relating to agricultural employment opportunities. The success of these efforts will tend to decrease the use of both headquarters and interoffice clearance for supplying agricultural labor, since authentic information for the guidance of the person seeking agricultural work can be made available prior to the existence of any considerable labor shortage, and should, in fact, eliminate to a large extent any actual shortages.

The operations of the information stations will have a similar effect, since current information can be made immediately available to those seeking work.

Mr. OSMERS. I would like to ask another question: I think you said at the beginning that this service had 12 offices?

Mr. HUXLEY. That is correct.

Mr. OSMERS. And it has how many now?

Mr. HUXLEY. Eighty-one.

Mr. OSMERS. In your offices during the past year have you noticed any increase or decrease in the number of out-of-State applicants for positions? I mean, does it seem to the service that immigration into California is continuing at the pace that——

Mr. HUXLEY (interrupting). At the pace it had in 1938, we will say, or in 1939?

Mr. OSMERS. At the pace in 1937, 1938, and 1939.

Mr. HUXLEY. That is a question I can't answer. Generally, I think that we are probably getting at the moment more people in our offices. That, I think, is partly because of the fact that we are doing a better job.

Mr. OSMERS. I wasn't concerned with the number coming into your offices, but I was wondering whether your records were showing that people had been in California 2 or 3 months, or something like that, indicating a continued migration to California.

Mr. HUXLEY. May I refer that question to Mr. Wagenet?

Mr. OSMERS. Yes. Would you care to express yourself on that, Mr. Wagenet?

Mr. WAGENET. I can only give you a very general answer which is that——

Mr. OSMERS (interrupting). At best it will have to be a guess, and I realize that.

Mr. WAGENET. As I have information from the managers of local offices, I would say that the migration has not been as heavy during the last year as it was in the 2 or 3 previous years.

Mr. OSMERS. My own personal observation in the field would lead me to the same conclusion. I wondered whether there would be any supporting evidence for that feeling.

Mr. WAGENET. There would be supporting evidence, I think, through the so-called quarantine stations at the border stations.

Mr. OSMERS. They might have some information on that?

Mr. WAGENET. Yes.

(The following table showing in-migration during the past 5 years, was accepted to complete the record.)

Migrants entering California

(Persons, members of parties in need of manual employment, entering California by motor vehicle)

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
January	9, 437	6, 002	11, 627	4, 080	4, 131
February	3, 800	6, 260	9, 077	3, 582	4, 057
March	4, 152	8, 139	8, 930	4, 365	6, 100
April	5, 335	8, 006	7, 462	5, 596	7, 747
May	5, 524	9, 298	7, 080	6, 721	6, 741
June	6, 895	8, 907	5, 493	7, 519	6, 374
July	8, 418	9, 427	5, 298	7, 516	8, 417
August	10, 614	9, 707	5, 377	8, 304	8, 673
September	14, 129	9, 070	5, 781	7, 526	8, 084
October	13, 289	10, 026	6, 693	9, 739	7, 045
November	8, 892	11, 704	7, 793	8, 077	7, 812
December	7, 157	8, 430	4, 439	4, 934	5, 008
Total	97, 642	104, 976	85, 050	77, 959	80, 189

NOTE.—Figures include returning Californians.

The California "border count" was begun in June 1935 at the suggestion of the Farm Security Administration, and has been maintained continuously since that date. Acknowledgment is made to the California State Department of Agriculture for maintaining these counts which are made at border quarantine stations of the Division of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

Sources: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and Farm Security Administration.

Mr. Osmers. Now, Mr. Wagenet, in coming down through the San Joaquin Valley from San Francisco we have had a great many different statements as to the California Employment Service. How long have you been in the California Employment Service, Mr. Wagenet?

Mr. Wagenet. Since February 16, 1940.

Mr. Osmers. 1940? You are a newcomer to California?

Mr. Wagenet. No, I am not. I am a native son of California.

Mr. Osmers. What was your background before you assumed the position that you now hold?

Mr. Wagenet. Well, my immediate background was Director of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation of the Social Security Board, which applied to the entire country and to the three territorial jurisdictions.

Mr. Osmers. Now you have, of course, and can give us an entirely different picture of the service than Mr. Huxley who has been with it for some time. I wonder if you would care to express yourself about some of the features that you have noticed since you have been here.

Mr. Wagenet. Well, I might say, Mr. Congressman, that I had heard of criticism of the service before I came here. I think I can say that I had the feeling that much could be done with the employment service. I should also say that in my opinion, after looking it over in my earlier days here—that is, early in this year—I was rather impressed with the fact that there had been neither in California nor in any other State a truly nationally developed and expanded employment service in all the ramifications for which an employment service was set up.

Now, I mean by that that there was much to be done in veterans' placement; in rehabilitation; in junior placement, and in specialties of that character, as well as in agricultural placement and industrial placement with specialization in the industries as the industries needed that specialization.

Such matters as testing programs to secure a more objective appraisal of a worker's ability was done to a certain extent, and I might add here that in California that particular program centers in three centers in California, Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Francisco, and it was probably as good if not better than any other type of vocational service rendered by a State employment service anywhere in the United States.

Now that is not my own opinion. I am repeating there——

Mr. Osmers (interrupting). That was to fit yourself for the appraising of the quality of the application or placing his usefulness?

Mr. Wagenet. With special reference in the case I am speaking of now to the juniors.

Mr. Osmers. To the juniors?

Mr. Wagenet. They have done an excellent job, and I give you that appraisal not as my own but as coming from an authority in Washington who was here and who specializes in that field.

From what I know of those offices, I would verify his appraisal.

Now the employment service in California must, as you know, cover a wide area with a great variation in geographical conditions and in crop conditions; as well as in industrial conditions.

Mr. Osmers. I think, Mr. Wagenet, after 2 days coming through just that one part of California, from San Francisco to here, that the committee is ready to agree with you on that statement.

Mr. Wagenet. Thank you. I didn't mean to sell you California, but I just wanted to lay the basis in the record for the fact that there is this tremendous variation and tremendous area to cover and a variation that encompasses maritime operations as well as agricultural operations, as well as intensified industrial operations, et cetera. I think that we have everything to contend with in California from the employment point of view that any other State in the Union has and really more. They are all centered out here in California.

In addition to that you have a shifting population; otherwise you gentlemen wouldn't be here. We have this migrant population on top of it and we have all that goes with that, social and economic readjustment operating in that area, and that is a very difficult area in which to operate.

Mr. Osmers. I might make just an observation, Mr. Wagenet: In investigating this subject on the Atlantic coast we ran into quite a similar situation to that which you have in your San Joaquin Valley, where workers go from crop to crop as the season advances, but the difference is that here the entire cycle is set in California and the State has the workers with it for 12 months of the year and on the Atlantic coast they will pass through 10 States and may not spend over, at the most, 2 months in any one State, so that the burden is all divided up.

Mr. Wagenet. If you will permit me, I would like to say that we have the bulk of the workers with us the full year, but we have a large interstate migration, also.

Mr. Osmers. I can appreciate that, both from the north and to the east.

Mr. Wagenet. Yes.

Mr. Osmers. Now, looking at the employment service, the question was, What are the immediate problems?

Mr. Wagenet. Undoubtedly the whole service has to be braced up. One of the first problems—and the one I think you are primarily interested in—was that of agricultural labor. I wanted to know what California had been doing in agricultural labor. I wanted to know why they hadn't gone further than they had. I wanted to know what could be done to improve the relationship and what we, as an organization, could do and what we would like to see in the way of cooperation from those whom we were serving.

One of the first things we did—if you are interested in a little of the details——

Mr. Osmers. That is just what we want, Mr. Wagenet.

AGRICULTURAL PLACEMENT OFFICES

Mr. Wagenet (continuing). Was to establish the position of supervisor of agricultural placement for the whole State. In other words, we put in the hands of one man the responsibility of seeing that the offices located in the agricultural areas were properly staffed to handle the agricultural problem as it would arise and to tie in all offices into a general State-wide program so that we would be able to send workers where they were needed.

Now along with that we braced up the agricultural offices that needed specialists in agricultural placement. We hired additional personnel for that purpose. Then, in order to have accurate and current information concerning the agricultural labor problem, and the crop problem—because the two go hand in hand—we instituted a very complete agricultural labor report, and in building up that report so that it would be most effective to those who were interested, we asked the statisticians of the employer associations, notably the chamber of commerce, the Associated Farmers, and statisticians of farm problems of the universities at Stanford and California, in particular, of the State department of agriculture, and of any others and of several other organizations who were interested in this problem, to assist in building up a form for this agricultural labor and crop report. That report or that form was sent to a large number of agencies and it was instituted on a weekly basis beginning the 1st of June. That report is published each week and I have copies that I will be very glad to make a part of this record so that the committee may study them.[1] The report naturally has to start on an experimental basis, but it is growing more and more accurate and more valuable every day. We are given to understand from those who are using it, such as chambers of commerce, that it is an invaluable report, and as time goes on it will become more valuable. That tells us precisely when a certain crop, and each crop in California, will come into harvest or when it will require farm labor, and the periods for which it will need this farm labor; the peak of the period, how many workers will be needed, whether or not those workers will or will not be on the ground, or will be secured locally, and how many will have to come from outside sources.

Then, in addition to that, we set up three information centers for migrant agricultural laborers. One center is in Indio, one near Bakersfield—I hope you had the pleasure of seeing what they are doing there as far as that service goes—and the one west of Pacheco Pass. (See maps facing page and on p. 2857.)

That service is designed primarily to direct agricultural labor to where the labor is needed and to give information to the workers and also to local growers concerning the status of labor supply in the various communities. The intent there is to cut down useless travel of migrants, and I think the intent has justified the cost so far. As a matter of fact, my own opinion is that that principle or method should be extended further in California.

Mr. OSMERS. Have you had enough experience with these three operations, the one at Indio, the one at Bakersfield—I didn't get the name of the other——

Mr. WAGENET. Pacheco Pass.

Mr. OSMERS (continuing). Pacheco Pass, to give you any indication as to its future usefulness?

Mr. WAGENET. Yes. We have and I have a report that I would like to leave with the committee. It is not a very long one. I may say that 2,381 persons stopped at those 3 stations since June 1 and were given farm information. In many cases they were placed locally and a number of them were told where to go.

Mr. OSMERS. In other words, they were being widely used?

Mr. WAGENET. They were being used, but not nearly as much as they will if the system continues in the State. I think we can also, as I say, establish other centers such as these during the harvest season.

---

[1] Sample weekly reports by counties and crops are held in committee files.


CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT
of
EMPLOYMENT
REGIONS
&
LOCAL OFFICES
JUNE 17, 1940
REGION ONE
ALTURAS – 90
DUNSMUIR – 91
REDDING – 92
RED BLUFF – 94
SUSANVILLE – 93
QUINCY – 83
CHICO – 80
OROVILLE – 84
MARYSVILLE – 82
GRASS VALLEY – 56
ROSEVILLE – 74
PLACERVILLE – 57
SACRAMENTO – 59
LODI – 26
STOCKTON – 60
SONORA – 61
MODESTO – 62
TURLOCK – 67
MERCED – 52
MADERA – 51
BISHOP – 78
FRESNO – 55
HANFORD – 50
VISALIA – 53
PORTERVILLE – 68
BAKERSFIELD – 77
REGION TWO
EUREKA – 95
UKIAH – 65
NAPA – 63
SANTA ROSA – 66
VALLEJO – 58
PITTSBURG – 36
RICHMOND – 35
SAN RAFAEL – 64
BERKELEY – 32
OAKLAND – 33
SAN FRANCISCO – Com'l – 20
" Industrial – 22
ALAMEDA – 31
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO – 54
PALO ALTO – 43
HAYWARD – 34
SAN MATEO – 46
SAN JOSE – 44
SANTA CRUZ – 47
WATSONVILLE – 28
SALINAS – 45
MONTEREY – 27
SAN LUIS OBISPO – 71
SANTA MARIA – 72
SANTA BARBARA – 70
REGION THREE
VENTURA – 73
VAN NUYS – 15
HOLLYWOOD – 04
SANTA MONICA – 13
CULVER CITY – 02
LOS ANGELES – Com'l. – 17
" " Industrial – 11
INGLEWOOD – 06
TORRANCE – 14
LONG BEACH – 07
SAN PEDRO – 12
REGION THREE
SAN FERNANDO – 10
PASADENA – 08
GLENDALE – 03
ONTARIO – 39
SAN BERNARDINO – 41
COVINA – 18
POMONA – 09
ALHAMBRA – 01
REDLANDS – 79
WHITTIER – 16
RIVERSIDE – 40
HUNTINGTON PARK – 05
SANTA ANA – 42
EL CENTRO – 48
SAN DIEGO – 49

Mr. OSMERS. Now, there is another point that I think is probably the keystone of the success of your organization, and that is the question of grower cooperation. Now, in the committee's tour through the State we found instances of fine grower cooperation and we found some instances of great grower resistance to anything that had to do with the employment service.

Now, what are you intending to do along those lines, Mr. Wagenet, or what has been done?

GROWER'S COOPERATION WITH SERVICE

Mr. WAGENET. Well there again, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, I thought that much could be done. On April 18, I think it was, of this year, I met with the agriculture committee of the State chamber of commerce, at 350 Bush Street—their offices in San Francisco—and discussed briefly at that time the problem of cooperation between their members and the department. It developed at that meeting that there was a serious question in the minds of growers as to whether they could use the service because of the referral or the inability of this service, under the rules of the Wagner-Peyser Act, to refer workers where there was a labor dispute. We discussed that problem at some length but without reaching any conclusion. I explained that the question of referral in a labor dispute is a matter that has come to each State agency under the rules and regulations of the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the State agency must, under the terms of its agreement, carry out those rules. That was one problem.

Another problem was the question of speed in supplying the workers; speed in determining whether or not there was a labor dispute, and underlying that whole matter of cooperation with the farmers which has come to me from several different sources, is the question of the insurance of the employees of the farmers, that is to say, bringing the employees of the farmers under the unemployment compensation insurance in the State.

It goes without saying, and I will say it is common knowledge, that the agriculturists of the State do not want to come under the unemployment compensation insurance features. That has a bearing on this whole problem. There is no question about it.

Now, because that is a very serious question, a most serious one, because we must have the growers' cooperation to place labor, and to place competent labor—we can serve the grower and we can give him competent labor if we are given a chance to do it—so I wrote a letter following that meeting, sometime following, and I wrote a letter to the secretary of the agricultural committee—a copy of which I have here and would like to put in the record—suggesting that we do set up a real cooperative venture and saying that the department was more than willing to go ahead on such a proposition. I received an answer 3 days later, on June 4, thanking me for the letter and saying it was a splendid offer of cooperation, "which I am sure will be appreciated throughout the State. I shall particularly bring it to the attention of our various committees," but I have never heard anything further on this matter of cooperation since that letter of June 4. That has not stopped us, however, from attempting to meet with farmers and farm organizations whenever we can to explain the service.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

June 1, 1940.

Mr. R. N. Wilson,
Agricultural Director, State Chamber of Commerce,
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Mr. Wilson: In the report on migrants published by the State chamber of commerce there are two recommendations in which I am particularly interested. These recommendations are: (1) "That necessary steps be taken to provide for effective reorganization of the California State Employment Service, designed to provide a farm placement service which will more adequately service the needs of the farmers and workers," and (2) "That necessary steps be taken to develop more adequate information on current crop developments and farm-labor requirements, needed both for better guidance of seasonal workers to available jobs, and for the proper organization of camps and housing."

You will recall that I discussed both of these problems with your committee on agriculture in the Chamber of Commerce Building on April 18 and made a definite plea for cooperation between farmer and farm groups and this department. I wish to renew that offer of cooperation and to extend it.

Since the meeting referred to above, the appointment of Frank Buckner as coordinator of agricultural placements has been made to the field service of this department, and three information centers for directing migrant farm labor have been established. In addition another major innovation is the development of agricultural labor and crop report on a weekly basis for obtaining current and accurate information at the source concerning demand and supply of labor crop by crop. I need not tell you that this schedule was developed with the assistance of a representative number of economists and statisticians in private, State, and Federal services, among them being yourself, Pat Merrick, William Sturm, and Herbert Ormsby of your organization.

You will also be interested to know that we have assurances from the Social Security Board that funds will be provided for the employment of additional personnel in the placement service throughout the State with special emphasis on agricultural labor.

The department is eager to assist the agricultural group as well as any other employers to the end that the particular needs may be promptly and adequately met. To be sure some situations require special techniques and understanding, as is the case in agricultural labor, but that in my opinion is no reason why the State service should not be used to the utmost nor why it cannot give complete service. It would seem that a willingness to cooperate is the first move. That I assure you is the purpose of this letter. May we have your cooperation?

Very truly yours,

R. G. Wagenet,
Executive Director, Department of Employment.

California State Chamber of Commerce,
Agriculture, and Industry,
San Francisco, June 4, 1940.

Mr. R. G. Wagenet,
Executive Secretary, California Employment Commission,
Sacramento, Calif.

Dear Mr. Wagenet: Thank you very much for your letter of June 1. Yours is a splendid offer of cooperation which I am sure will be appreciated throughout the State. I shall take the liberty of bringing it to the attention of our various committees.

Again assuring you that your cooperation is sincerely appreciated, I am

Very sincerely,

R. N. Wilson,
Director, Agricultural Department.

RULING ON LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. Osmers. I would like to have you explain to the committee, or place into the record for the committee right at this point, the ruling on labor disputes that you have from Washington, because, after all, that is the ruling that you must go by, is it not, Mr. Wagenet?

Mr. WAGENET. Yes, sir; it is. I will be very glad to do that. I have that with me.

Mr. OSMERS. I have read it and I want to make my own observation that I think it is entirely too broad for the proper functioning of an office such as yours. Now maybe you don't agree with me and maybe you don't want to express an opinion on it.

Mr. WAGENET. My opinion, Mr. Congressman, is that we can work out a satisfactory relationship, I think, under this ruling.

Mr. OSMERS. You think you can?

Mr. WAGENET. I am rather hopeful that we can. I think that we can get that ruling interpreted so that we can.

Mr. OSMERS. I think you'd better have a migrant Philadelphia attorney here to do that for you.

There was one other thing——

Mr. WAGENET (interposing). We would be glad to have your help.

Mr. OSMERS. I am neither an attorney nor am I from Philadelphia. I am sorry.

Mr. WAGENET. May I put in evidence——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I might make this suggestion—excuse me, Congressman——

Mr. OSMERS (interposing). I want that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. You shall have it.

You have some other reports there, and if you would place them in a folder, we will mark it an exhibit so that we will have the whole thing.

Mr. WAGENET. That is fine. I will give you the whole series here.

(The ruling referred to above is as follows:)

POLICY IN APPLYING SECTION 21.12 OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO DISCRIMINATION IN REFERRALS

The rules and regulations amended as relating to discrimination in referrals provide:

"The State service shall require that each employment office under its supervision, in referring applicants to positions, shall refrain from any act of discrimination with respect to any person on the grounds of that person's affiliation or nonaffiliation with a labor organization. The term 'act of discrimination' as used herein shall not be construed to include referrals of persons affiliated with a labor organization on the basis of an order so specifying from an employer pursuant to his agreement or understanding, written or otherwise, with representatives of employees affiliated with such labor organization."

Section 21.12 is designed to prevent State employment services from knowingly abetting violations of Federal or State laws governing labor relations. Thus, to refer for employment, either pursuant to an order of an employer or otherwise, persons selected because of their nonaffiliation with a labor organization, would clearly be in violation of the rule. Referrals, however, may be limited, pursuant to an order of an employer so specifying, to persons affiliated with a labor organization in the various types of situations in which it would be lawful for the employer to condition employment on such affiliation.

Information concerning union affiliation, veteran status, race, religion, etc., is secured from an applicant solely for the purpose of facilitating the advantageous placement of the applicant and should be used for no other purpose.—Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Board, August 30, 1940.

PROCEDURES IN APPLYING SECTION 21.10 OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO REFERRALS IN LABOR DISPUTES

The rules and regulations amended as relating to referrals in labor disputes provide:

"The State service shall require that each employment office under its supervision refrain from referring any person or persons to any positions left vacant by reason of a labor dispute at any place of employment by a person belonging to a grade or class of workers participating in, or directly interested in, such labor dispute at such place of employment. For the purposes of this rule, the term 'labor dispute' shall include any controversy concerning terms or conditions of employment or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment regardless of whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee."

In carrying out this rule the State employment service and all local offices should under no circumstances make any referral which will aid, directly or indirectly, in filling any vacancy existing or created by reason of a labor dispute.

An example of indirect assistance which is to be avoided is making referrals to vacancies created at any place of employment by transfer of persons to positions made vacant by reason of a labor dispute.

In carrying out this rule the State employment security agency should arrange with the State agency which receives notice of labor disputes for prompt notification of any labor disputes coming to the attention of such agency. Such notification should be in writing and should give the pertinent details of the dispute.

In addition, the State employment security agency should arrange with the various union organizations for prompt notification of any labor disputes in which such organizations might be involved, which notification should likewise be in writing and should set forth the details of the dispute.

The State employment security agency should notify managers of all employment offices under its supervision to arrange with local labor organizations for prompt notification of labor disputes, which notification should be in writing and should set forth the details of the dispute.

In addition to the notice of labor disputes received from any State agencies or from labor organizations as set forth above, the State director and the managers of local employment offices, upon the receipt of information from any source as to the existence of any labor dispute, should immediately verify the existence of such labor dispute by contact with the parties involved.

When notice has been received in accordance with the procedure set forth above, that a labor dispute exists at a certain place of employment, no person shall be referred to any position which is vacant by reason of such labor dispute at such place of employment until such time as the State employment security agency has received notice from both of the parties involved (or until the State employment security agency has made an independent determination) that the labor dispute does not exist and a notice to that effect has been placed on file in the local employment office.—Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Board, August 30, 1940.

(Other exhibits contained in the above-mentioned file will be found at the end of the testimony of Messrs. Huxley and Wagenet, p. 2847.)

Mr. Osmers. There is just one phase, Mr. Chairman, that I have left. As you know, I am now leaving the work of the committee and I wish you would have Mr. Huxley or Mr. Wagenet, or both, discuss the local relief client phase as it affects the unemployed, as it affects their work—in other words, should they refer local people or should they refer people that are coming in from somewhere else—that phase—and if you will excuse me, I will see you in Washington.

(At this point Congressman Osmers left the hearing.)

The Chairman. What I am interested in, gentlemen—of course, this employment set-up within the States is important, and we have heard so much of it—but the resolution that passed the House of Representatives provided that a survey and investigation of the migration of destitute citizens is what our jurisdiction is, and so many times we get lost in the maze of the States' employment agencies, and I am interested primarily in the men and women and children who start out and have to leave home under circumstances over which they have no control. I am interested to see how they are treated when they leave home and go through the State lines, and to see if we can better their situation. That is what I am interested in.

Now we had a family here this morning—probably you heard them—of eight children, three of whom were here. They started out with $46, and some of them do not start out with that much. There is no question but that they have been kicked around at the State lines, and they don't know where to go. The first thing that the committee is deeply interested in is in these private employment agencies at the State lines where they take some of their last pennies and give them misinformation. I think that Congress has jurisdiction over them as soon as they send them across State lines. It is a hit-and-miss proposition. A third of the migrants are children. They are going from State to State, and various States make it a misdemeanor if they transport citizens across State lines. South Dakota makes it a penitentiary offense. There are no barriers against goods but there are against the human interstate commerce.

This is the sort of a picture I have gotten in my mind. It may be a little far-fetched.

On Highway 66, or on our public highways from the east to the west or from the west to the east, or on a border, a migrant family starts out from Oklahoma and they go through these States. They come to this State line. You could walk out—you could do it or Mr. Huxley could—and ask them where they are going. They say they don't know. They had to leave home. The farm is gone. They have $25. They don't know where they are going. You can say to them, "Well, I think that the best thing for you to is to stay here tonight. The State and the Government have fixed some cabins where you can stay overnight. We have cold water and you can cook your supper. I will be over there after awhile and I will talk things over with you and I will give you the best facts I have as to whether you should turn back or whether you should go on."

Don't you think that something like that would be helpful?

Mr. Wagenet. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman. I think it can be done.

The Chairman. Do you? Well, I would like to hear why and how it can be done.

Mr. Wagenet. At the present time we see migrants coming into the State now, at Indio, and near Bakersfield. Those are the main migrant people who are coming in.

Let us put it this way: The stations are there if they care to stop at them. We do not stop anyone. We have signs posted 300 yards on both sides of these offices and they may stop if they care to, but we don't actually stop them.

Now the quarantine people, I understand, do stop them at the border.

The Chairman. They are looking for fruit diseases?

Mr. Wagenet. That is right.

The Chairman. But they don't know anything about the diseases of the human heart or anything like that; they are to take care of other things?

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. WAGENET. It would be possible to have those people give to the migrants either the instructions by word of mouth or by pamphlet saying that there was an office right down the road, and we might have the offices closer to the quarantine office, as a matter of fact, and contact them when they stop in at that office and talk with them about work opportunities. We can do something in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be wonderful. I will tell you why—I don't want to interrupt you—it is estimated that between three and four million people traveled last year—that is more or less of an approximation—good American citizens traveling from State to State; destitute, it is true, but you can't keep kicking around that number of American citizens without striking at the morale of this country. It just cannot be done by raising these criminal barriers and in such ways. I don't know whether your attention has been called to it, but the census figures are being delayed at Washington on account of these hundreds of thousands of citizens who have lost their residence in one State and haven't gained it in another. They are homeless and jobless and still all American citizens. The census department doesn't know what States to allocate them to. You wouldn't do that with steel and iron. You would know how to handle that all right enough, but the human question they don't touch.

I think, and don't you think, that this is really a national problem, Mr. Wagenet?

Mr. WAGENET. There is no question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. There will come a time when individual States cannot handle it.

Mr. WAGENET. I think we have had some experience already that indicates that it is more than a State problem; that it should at least be a regional problem, and from a regional problem it would probably grow right into a national problem. We have begun to see the problem, as a couple of years ago there was quite a study made on the migration of workers, especially agricultural workers, by the W. P. A., showing the cycle that the workers took, which defined that cycle as extending almost from coast to coast for certain workers. It is quite an intricate pattern throughout the Middle West to the Pacific States. That undoubtedly indicates that it is a national problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Well now, gentlemen, we certainly appreciate everything you have done, but we have a great many witnesses and we only have one day here. I will tell you what I would like to have you remember, that our record will not be closed until the last week of November and if anything further occurs to you gentlemen in addition to what your statistics show, or if new conditions come to the State employment department of the State of California, you will be granted permission to forward such information to the committee at Washington and we will insert it, and anything that you have here now that you want to place in a folder, we will send it back to Washington and I will have it marked as an exhibit and it will be there.

Mr. WAGENET. I would like very much to present it here. I will leave it with the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have it all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to ask one question. In your opinion is there sufficient legislation authorizing the employment service to render this type of service that Mr. Tolan asked you about and that you described?

Mr. WAGENET. Yes, sir. The question becomes, unfortunately, one of money, solely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We always run into that, and then cooperation.

Mr. WAGENET. Well, California can do it alone, but it would be more effective——

Mr. SPARKMAN (interrupting). I mean cooperation between the employment service, the laborers, and the employers.

Mr. WAGENET. Oh, yes. That is right. We have a real understanding of what the service can do; the limitations of the service, and we can show the consequences of the service, the necessity of constant progress in keeping in touch with the community and developing with the community. If we can have that sort of cooperation from all sides, we wouldn't have any trouble.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The machinery is set up?

Mr. WAGENET. That machinery is here.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Giving you the personnel and the equipment to operate?

Mr. WAGENET. That is right; but we can get more and more personnel as the service develops, but we have to have the other man give us the orders for the workers and then we can get such personnel.

Now just one point I might mention here, and that is that you must realize that there are and have been literally thousands of workers at the farmers' fences waiting for those jobs to open all along the line, so that we really had no chance to make a placement, and why should we if the workers are right there? Why inconvenience all concerned? There is a worker and the farmer takes him. That is perfectly all right and is a perfectly natural operation if it comes to that degree where you have that large surplus of labor, but where a selection is necessary, where there isn't that surplus of labor on the ground, then our service can bring that labor, qualified labor, to the employer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do you give priority to the California citizens over nonresidents or the migrants?

Mr. WAGENET. No, sir; we do not. We select on the basis of qualification of the worker for the particular job offered.

The CHAIRMAN. We will mark that as an exhibit.

(The documents referred to were received and marked as an exhibit.)

(A revised report of the California Department of Employment was received later and appears below:)

REVISED REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, NOVEMBER 15, 1940

MR. CHAIRMAN: Most authorities agree that the migratory labor problem in this State primarily involves agricultural workers.

The State department of employment has, therefore, extended its program to include a regular agricultural reporting service which will give reliable answers to the questions usually asked by migrant workers. This report contains information from which answers can be given to such questions as—

Is there farm work in California?
Where is this work to be found?
When will the work begin?

How long will the work last?
Is there a surplus or a shortage of labor for harvesting crops?
What are the wages and living conditions?

Agricultural Labor Report by Counties and Crops

Since May 31, of this year, data has been secured and reported on a weekly basis by the managers of department offices for all counties of the State in which there is any significant agricultural activity.

Data reported by office managers are tabulated, summarized and published weekly for immediate distribution to each of the 81 regular offices, to the 3 information stations, and to such special seasonal offices as are being operated at the time.

These reports are used to aid those seeking agricultural work and are also of considerable value to agricultural employers as an index of labor supply.

These reports are limited to those crop activities which require a considerable number of workers not regularly employed on a year round basis, and do not include dairying, livestock raising, etc. For this reason these reports are not comparable in some respects to those secured by other agencies.

Information is secured and reported weekly for all items appearing on Form DE 881, a copy of which is attached for your consideration.

Very obviously there are no complete or accurate available data covering some of the reported items. Estimates are made by each office manager on the basis of his own knowledge of local conditions, and with the cooperation of such other agencies or individuals as may be able to supply pertinent information. When changes in estimates are required because of new developments between regular weekly reporting periods, supplementary reports are issued.

The usefulness of these reports to those seeking agricultural work or to employers is dependent very largely upon securing and supplying the information in the shortest possible time.

There is every evidence that this reporting program has already become of considerable value to both the agricultural worker and employer. Continued improvement in the accuracy, completeness and consistency of the data shown will further increase the utility of the reports.

Copies of the State of California Department of Employment Agricultural Labor Report, Forms DE 881 A and DE 881 B, are also attached for your inspection. This report is available to any agency who might be interested and the information contained thereon can be used by States to regulate the interstate movement of workers seeking agricultural employment.

INFORMATION STATIONS

The Department operated one experimental information station at Bakersfield during the fall of 1939. Based on the results of that experiment, three information stations are being operated this year for the specific purpose of serving migratory workers. These stations are located on main traveled routes at Indio, Bakersfield, and Pacheco Pass. Highway signs clearly indicate station locations. Stations are operated 7 days a week on a schedule of 11 hours each day. Their purpose is to give information to migratory workers and employers on agricultural working conditions throughout the State. Experience has shown that many worker would not otherwise seek information from the department.

This service has eliminated to a considerable extent useless and expensive travel to jobs that do not exist and has assisted in regulating the flow of labor to harvest activities.

INFORMATION SERVICE

Pamphlets entitled "Information for Farm Workers," printed in English and Spanish, are being distributed to agricultural workers by all field offices of the Department.

In addition to the distribution through department of employment offices, the State department of agriculture, division of entomology and plant quarantine, is also distributing these pamphlets through their 12 border quarantine stations. These stations are located at the State line on all main traveled highways leading into the State. This cooperative plan provides a widespread distribution of information regarding department of employment services. (Copies of the pamphlets appear on pp. ———.)

SEASONAL OFFICES

Four seasonal agricultural placement offices have been operated this year. These offices were located in isolated communities where intensive short-term harvests required great numbers of workers. Seasonal offices have filled approximately 6,000 farm jobs during the season. These placements are in addition to approximately 46,000 farm jobs filled by regular Department offices. It has been proven that this type of service is very practical and that a widespread opportunity exists for seasonal offices in California. Plans are being made to operate seven additional seasonal offices during the spring months to take care of isolated harvests of vegetable and early fruit crops. Seasonal offices are established only for the duration of the particular harvest involved. They are staffed by persons familiar with the crop being handled. These offices work closely with the regular offices of the Department and provide a full-placement service for their respective communities during the period of operation.

STATE SUPERVISION OF FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

The California Department of Employment has recently undertaken direct supervision of its farm-placement program. This is in contrast to a former plan of cooperation and joint responsibility with the United States Farm Placement Service. State administration and supervision of the farm program is desirable because of complete authority being vested in the one agency.

This clarifies field operations and eliminates confusion as to administrative authority and operating functions. The new organization plan does not in any way interfere with interstate relationships or complicate working arrangements with other State or Federal agencies.

GENERAL

The California State Department of Employment is deeply concerned with the migratory labor problem and appreciates this opportunity to appear before your committee. Any data or information from our records which may be of interest to the committee, will be gladly put at your disposal.

RECOMMENDATION

To facilitate the operation of the Farm Placement Service, we recommend that there should be farm-placement supervisors who would report to the head of the United States Farm Placement Service in Washington, but who would work through the various regional offices and the State services as situations requiring their attention arose. Such area supervisors would coordinate the work of the States in connection with migratory labor and would be of technical assistance in developing the State farm-placement program.

CALIFORNIA PLACEMENT RECORD

The following record of placements is taken from official reports of the Social Security Board, and the California Department of Employment.

Total complete placements, all industries, for 10 highest States

1936		1937	
1. California	442, 521	1. Texas	391, 671
2. New York	402, 176	2. New York	276, 292
3. Pennsylvania	348, 873	3. California	275, 434
4. Texas	342, 152	4. Illinois	275, 276
5. Illinois	316, 421	5. Ohio	219, 798
6. Michigan	160, 318	6. Pennsylvania	175, 532
7. Missouri	150, 042	7. Michigan	107, 709
8. Wisconsin	134, 696	8. Minnesota	98, 038
9. New Jersey	129, 251	9. North Carolina	97, 781
10. North Carolina	124, 192	10. Iowa	93, 447

Total complete placements, all industries, for 10 highest States—Continued

1938

1. Texas	378, 266
2. California	223, 283
3. New York	165, 224
4. Illinois	148, 375
5. Pennsylvania	112, 203
6. Ohio	98, 695
7. North Carolina	89, 823
8. Iowa	75, 960
9. Wisconsin	67, 239
10. Michigan	64, 650

1939

1. Texas	360, 897
2. California	258, 865
3. New York	247, 286
4. Ohio	148, 314
5. Illinois	138, 968
6. Michigan	130, 543
7. Pennsylvania	124, 310
8. North Carolina	107, 634
9. New Jersey	106, 463
10. Iowa	90, 383

1940 (January–August)

1. Texas	224, 547
2. New York	197, 705
3. California	159, 882
4. Ohio	112, 258
5. Illinois	102, 830
6. Pennsylvania	96, 581
7. Michigan	82, 249
8. New Jersey	71, 010
9. Washington	66, 659
10. Georgia	65, 199

Source: Unpublished data compiled by the Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Board, Research and Statistics Division, October 28. 1940. Data reported by State agencies, corrected to October 25, 1940.

State of California total placements (complete and supplemental), all industries

	Total	Complete	Supplemental
1936	442, 521		
1937	275, 434		
1938	242, 270	223, 283	18, 987
1939	306, 774	258, 865	47, 909
1940 (January-October)	268, 183	215, 907	52, 276

Sources: Unpublished data compiled by the Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Board, Research and Statistics Division, October 28, 1940, data corrected to Oct. 25, 1940; and official records of the Department of Employment, State of California.

State of California agricultural placements (complete and supplemental)

1936	58, 321
1937	65, 897
1938	43, 030
1939	58, 770
1940 (January–October)	51, 774

More agricultural placements were made in September and October 1940 than in any 2-month period in the history of the department.

Source: Official records, Department of Employment, State of California.

Information Stations Survey and Statistical Charts

INFORMATION REGARDING MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Between June 3 and August 31, 1940, some 2,383 workers seeking agricultural employment secured information from the three roadside agricultural labor information stations maintained by the California Department of Employment. These stations, located near Indio and Bakersfield and in Pacheco Pass (on three of the main routes traveled by migrant agricultural laborers), provide current information about openings in agricultural work in all counties of the State. They were opened for the 1940 season on June 3, as an expansion of the program begun in 1939, when a single station was maintained near Bakersfield from July 15 to December 11.

Analysis of the social and economic characteristics of the group using information station facilities should give some knowledge, by implication, of the entire migrant agricultural labor population of the State. Great care must be used in applying any conclusions outside the group studied, however, since it is not a carefully selected sample of the entire population of migrant agricultural laborers, but rather a group that may well be considered unrepresentative for the very reason of having made use of departmental facilities. It is reasonable to assume that workers new to the State or to migrant agricultural labor would be more likely to use these facilities than old hands confident from past experience that they knew where satisfactory jobs could be secured—to mention only one of the possible causes of difference between this group and the entire group of migratory agricultural workers.

Parties calling at the station.—A total of 1,189 parties stopped at the three stations during June, July, and August, 1,026 of which included agricultural workers. Comprising these parties were 2,383 persons seeking agricultural work; 624 children under 14; 131 persons seeking nonagricultural work (i. e., work not in field or truck crops, and fruit); and 289 persons not seeking work—wives, employers, tourists, State or Federal officials, etc.

The average number of persons per party, for the 1,026 parties including workers, was 2.9; the average number of workers, 2.3.

Place of origin of workers.—Information secured from 2,055 of the workers seeking agricultural employment showed that 40 percent (827) were originally from California and 50 percent (1,030) from States classified by the Farm Security Administration as drought States.[1] More than 10 percent of the workers came from each of the States of Oklahoma, Arizona, and Texas, while no other State was given as the place of origin of more than 5 percent of the workers. One hundred nine workers were reported as coming from Mexico; all, however, residents of California.

Place of last employment.—Some 76 percent of the 2,106 workers from whom information was secured as to the last place of employment were last employed in California. Seven percent were employed in Arizona and 17 percent in other States of the Union, for the most part the State of origin of the worker. Some variation appears between the groups applying at the different information stations: Ninety-one percent of the workers applying for information at the Pacheco Pass station worked last in California, while only 65 percent of those applying at both the Indio and the Bakersfield stations had worked last in California. The geographical location of the stations probably accounts for this difference. Conversely, 13 percent of the workers applying at the Indio station had worked last in Arizona, compared with only 2 percent of those at the Pacheco Pass station.

Type of last employment.—Ninety-five percent of the persons seeking agricultural employment information had worked last on an agricultural job and only 5 percent at nonagricultural employment. This report agrees closely with information secured about the agricultural experience of those workers—approximately 91 percent of them (1,991) having more than 5 years' experience in agricultural employment.

California residence.—California residence, defined as having spent a major portion of the past 2 years within the State (presumably with the intention of securing residence in the State), was claimed by 59 percent of the workers (1,345) calling at all the stations. The Indio station showed only 49 percent of the workers as residents and failed to report the residence of 15 percent. Bakersfield reported 45 percent of the workers as residents, and Pacheco Pass—the station with the largest proportion of people last working in California—reported 76 percent of the workers were residents.

Information secured concerning the length of time the workers had sought employment in California should serve as a further indication of California residence. The proportion of workers having worked 5 or more years in California varies with proximity to the Arizona border—as does the proportion of residents to nonresidents, and of persons working last in California to those working last elsewhere. The Indio station, nearest the border, reports 28 percent of the workers as having worked in California for 5 or more years and 41 percent less than 1 year; the Bakersfield station reports 40 percent of the workers with 5 years' or more experience in California, 48 percent with less than 1 year. The Pacheco Pass station reports 73 percent of the workers with 5 years' or more experience in California and 19 percent with less than 1 year.

---

[1] The classification used is that given in Rowell, E. J. "Drought Refugee and Labor Migration to California in 1936," Mon. Labor Rev., vol. 43 (1936), pp. 1355–63, at page 1357.

Racial grouping and sex.—Some 82 percent of the workers calling at the stations belonged to the white race. Sixteen percent were Mexican. That the migratory habits of Mexican workers differ somewhat from others was indicated by the fact that the Pacheco Pass station reported more than half the Mexicans calling at all the stations, and had a much higher proportion of Mexican to white workers. Negroes, orientals, and other racial groups formed a negligible proportion of workers calling at the stations. Only 580 of the 2,383 workers calling at the stations were women. Four hundred sixty-five of these were white. Of the 1,803 men seeking agricultural work, 1,488 were white.

Social relationships of the workers.—One thousand four hundred one of the workers were traveling in family groups. The 889 traveling without a family were almost entirely white men. It is noteworthy that no women of the Mexican race were reported as traveling alone and only 24 white women seeking employment were so reported.

Six hundred twenty-four children under 14 accompanied the workers. Too much reliance cannot be placed on this figure, however, because in a number of instances the workers calling at the stations seemed to be scouting parties for families of undetermined size camped at some nearby locality.

TABLE 1.—*3,427 persons calling at agricultural information stations, by employment status, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Occupational status:	Number
Seeking agricultural work	2, 383
Seeking nonagricultural work	131
Not seeking work	289
Under 14 years of age	624
Total	3, 427

TABLE 2.—*Workers seeking agricultural employment, by place of origin. Callers at agricultural information stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Place of origin [1]	Number	Percent	Place of origin [1]	Number	Percent
California	827	40	New England States	2	
Drought States	1, 030	50	Republic of Mexico	109	5
Oregon and Washington	25	1			
Industrial States	37	2	Total	2, 055	99
Southern States	25	1	Not given [2]	328	

[1] States grouped as in Rowell, E. J., "Drought Refugee and Labor Migration to California in 1936," Mon. Lab. Rev., vol. 43 (1936), pp. 1355–63, at p. 1357.

[2] Includes 2 workers from Philippine Islands.

TABLE 3.—*Workers seeking agricultural employment, by place of last employment. Callers at agricultural information stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Place of last employment	Total		Station I		Station II		Station III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
California	1, 602	76	145	65	650	65	807	91
Arizona	148	7	29	13	102	10	17	2
Other States	356	17	49	22	245	25	62	7
Total	2, 106	100	223	100	997	100	886	100
Not given	277		132		50		95	

[2] Some 93 were not classified in the reports.

TABLE 4.—*Workers seeking agricultural employment, by type of last employment. Callers at agricultural information stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Type of last employment	Total		Station I		Station II		Station III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agricultural	1,890	95	176	98	825	91	889	98
Nonagricultural	98	5	4	2	78	9	16	2
Total	1,988	100	180	100	903	100	905	100
Not given	395		175		144		76	

TABLE 5.—*Workers seeking agricultural employment, by race. Callers at agricultural information stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Race	Total		Station I		Station II		Station III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	1,953	82	286	81	913	87	754	77
Mexican	383	16	50	14	110	11	223	23
Negro	34	1	16	5	18	2		
Other	13	1	3		6	1	4	
Total	2,383	100	355	100	1,047	100	981	100

TABLE 6.—*Sex, race, and membership in a family group for 2,383 persons seeking agricultural work, calling at agricultural information stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Sex and membership in family group	Total	Race			
		White	Mexican	Negro	Other
Men:					
Single	864	736	96	25	7
Married	860	688	162	5	5
Not given	79	64	14	1	
Total	1,803	1,488	272	31	12
Women:					
Single	25	24			1
Married	541	428	110	3	
Not given	14	13	1		
Total	580	465	111	3	1
Total	2,383	1,953	383	34	13

TABLE 7.—*Persons seeking agricultural work by years of agricultural experience in California—For workers stopping at the Indio, Bakersfield, and Pacheco Pass information stations June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Years' experience in California	Workers		Years' experience in California	Workers	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Total	2,383	100.0	3 years	82	3.4
			4 years	30	1.3
Less than 1	771	32.4	5 and over	1,144	48.1
1 year	115	4.8	Not given	191	7.9
2 years	50	2.1			

TABLE 8.—*Persons seeking agricultural work classified by years of agricultural experience in California and by place of origin—for persons interviewed at the Indio, Bakersfield, and Pacheco Pass agricultural information stations June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Place of origin	Total	Years agricultural experience in California						
		Less than 1	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 or more	Not given
Total all places of origin	2,383	771	115	50	82	30	1,144	189
California	827	0	6	6	33	3	767	12
Other than California	1,228	762	107	42	39	18	205	55
Texas	250	149	32	13	5	5	26	20
Oklahoma	248	172	26	14	13	6	11	6
Arizona	248	187	20	5	5	0	19	12
Mexico	109	0	0	0	0	0	102	7
Arkansas	85	50	4	3	13	3	9	3
Other [1]	288	204	25	7	3	4	38	7
Origin not given	328	9	2	2	10	9	172	122

[1] No other place of origin showed more than 36 persons.

TABLE 9.—*Total number of parties calling at agricultural information stations June 3–Aug. 31, 1940, by California residence, and type of work sought* [1]

	Total number of parties	Parties seeking work in—		Parties not seeking work
		Agriculture	Other	
Total, all stations	1,189	942	84	163
California residents	583	534	49	0
California nonresidents	396	371	25	0
Residence unknown	210	37	10	163

[1] Party means the group in an automobile, or 1 or more persons traveling together on foot. California resident is defined, for purposes of this study, as one who has spent the greater part of the past 2 years in California.

INFORMATION PAMPHLETS AND MAPS

This material is distributed by all department of employment offices, and by 12 border stations of the division of entomology and plant quarantine, California State Department of Agriculture.

INFORMATION FOR FARM WORKERS

For authentic work information check the nearest office of the California Department of Employment (list in this folder).

California's State Department of Employment maintains a clearing house of information concerning the need for farm labor in the various agricultural sections of the State.

Persons desiring farm work should inquire at one of the department offices (listed in this folder), as soon as possible.

In addition to the offices, three information centers are maintained. These are located near Indio (U S 99, 60, 70), south of Bakersfield (U S 99), and on the west side of Pacheco Pass (U S 152). Clearance of the demand for farm labor is available at these three centers, and in department offices.

Through contact with the department, the farm worker may obtain correct information of the condition of crops throughout the State. If jobs are available, the worker will be notified.

State of California Department of Employment

These placement offices are at your service:

Alameda, 1536 Park Street.
Alhambra, 27 East Valley Boulevard.
Alturas, 911 Main Street.
Bakersfield, 1300 Eighteenth Street.
Berkeley, 2459-2463 Shattuck Avenue.
Bishop, 124 South Main Street.
Chico, 345 West Fifth Street.
Covina, 120 East Badillo Street.
Culver City, 9343 Culver Boulevard.
Dunsmuir, 901 Sacramento Avenue.
El Centro, 134 South Sixth Street.
Eureka, 239 G Street.
Fresno, 2146 Inyo Street.
Glendale, 207 West Colorado Boulevard.
Grass Valley, 111 South Auburn Street.
Hanford, 311 North Douty Street.
Hayward, 963-967 C Street.
Hollywood, 5407 Santa Monica Boulevard.
Huntington Park, 6906-6910 Pacific Boulevard.
Inglewood, 351 East Queen Street.
Lodi, City Hall.
Long Beach, 416 Pine Avenue.
Los Angeles, 1200 South Grand Avenue.
Los Angeles (commercial and professional), 1050 South Hope Street.
Madera, 114 North F Street.
Marysville, 321 C Street.
Merced, 622 Nineteenth Street.
Modesto, 720 Tenth Street.
Monterey, 266 Pearl Street.
Napa, 1033 Coombs Street.
Oakland, 530 Eighteenth Street.
Ontario, Old Chamber of Commerce Building.
Oroville, 1944 Bird Street.
Palo Alto, 2086 El Camino Real.
Pasadena, 38 East Union Street.
Pittsburg, 2 East Fifth Street.
Placerville, 596 Main Street.
Pomona, 145 West Fifth Avenue.
Porterville, City Hall.
Quincy, Town Hall.
Red Bluff, Federal Building.
Redding, 1407 California Street.
Redlands, 14 Vine Street.
Richmond, 317 Sixth Street.
Riverside, 3469 Main Street.
Roseville, 700 Vernon Street.
Sacramento, 1330 J Street.
Sacramento, 1106 Second Street.
Salinas, 7 Natividad Street.
San Bernardino, 352 Court Street.
San Diego, 1165 Front Street.
San Fernando, 132 North Maclay Street.
San Francisco, 1690 Mission Street.
San Francisco (commercial and professional), 154 Sansome Street.
San Jose, 393 South Second Street.
San Luis Obispo, 967 Osos Street.
San Mateo, 15 B Street.
San Pedro, 250 West Seventh Street.
San Rafael, 1557 Fourth Street.
Santa Ana, 501 West Fifth Street.
Santa Barbara, 22 East Victoria Street.
Santa Cruz, 23 Front Street.
Santa Maria, 310 West Main Street.
Santa Monica, 1558 Fifth Street.
Santa Rosa, 501 Third Street.
Sonora, 811 North Washington Street.
South San Francisco, 215 Linden Avenue.
Stockton, 201 North San Joaquin Street.
Susanville, 800 Lassen Street.
Torrance, 1927 Carson Street.
Turlock, 138 South Center Street.
Ukiah, 20 Smith Street.
Vallejo, 515 Marin Street.
Van Nuys, 14529 Sylvan Street.
Ventura, 53 South California Street.
Visalia, 119 North Church Street.
Watsonville, 21 West Lake Avenue.
Whittier, 214 West Philadelphia Street.

INFORMACIÓN PARA LOS AGRICULTORES

Para obtener información auténtica de trabajo diríjase a una oficina del Departamento de Empleo del Estado de California (en este folleto encontrará usted la lista da direcciones).

El Departamento de Empleo del Estado de California mantiene una agencia central de información concerniente a la necesidad de trabajadores en las varias secciones agrícolas del estado.

Personas que desean trabajo en las haciendas debieran preguntar por información en una de las oficinas del departamento tan pronto como posible.

Además de las oficinas locales, hay tres centros de información. Estos están situados cerca de Indio (U. S. 99, 60, 70), al sur de Bakersfield (U. S. 99), y al oeste de Pacheco Pass (U. S. 152). A cualquier de estos tres despachos ó en las oficinas del departamento se puede averiguar las posibilidades para trabajo.

Por medio de este servicio, los trabajadores pueden consequir información correcta respecto á las cosechas en todas partes del estado. Si hay trabajo, se les notificarán.

Estado de California Departamento de Empleo

Estas oficinas estan dispuestas para servirle:

Alameda, 1536 Park Street.
Alhambra, 27 East Valley Boulevard.
Alturas, 911 Main Street.
Bakersfield, 1300 Eighteenth Street.
Berkeley, 2459-2463 Shattuck Avenue.
Bishop, 124 South Main Street.
Chico, 345 West Fifth Street.
Covina, 120 East Badillo Street.
Culver City, 9343 Culver Boulevard.
Dunsmuir, 901 Sacramento Avenue.
El Centro, 134 South Sixth Street.
Eureka, 239 G Street.
Fresno, 2146 Inyo Street.
Glendale, 207 West Colorado Boulevard.
Grass Valley, 111 South Auburn Street.
Hanford, 311 North Douty Street.
Hayward, 963-967 C Street.
Hollywood, 5407 Santa Monica Boulevard.
Huntington Park, 6906-6910 Pacific Boulevard.
Inglewood, 351 East Queen Street.
Lodi, City Hall.
Long Beach, 416 Pine Avenue.
Los Angeles, 1200 South Grand Avenue.
Los Angeles (commercial and professional), 1050 South Hope Street.
Madera, 114 North F Street.
Marysville, 321 C Street.
Merced, 622 Nineteenth Street.
Modesto, 720 Tenth Street.
Monterey, 266 Pearl Street.
Napa, 1033 Coombs Street.
Oakland, 530 Eighteenth Street.
Ontario, Old Chamber of Commerce Building.
Oroville, 1944 Bird Street.
Palo Alto, 2086 El Camino Real.
Pasadena, 38 East Union Street.
Pittsburg, 2 East Fifth Street.
Placerville, 596 Main Street.
Pomona, 145 West Fifth Avenue.
Porterville, City Hall.
Quincy, Town Hall.
Red Bluff, Federal Building.
Redding, 1407 California Street.
Redlands, 14 Vine Street.
Richmond, 317 Sixth Street.
Riverside, 3469 Main Street.
Roseville, 700 Vernon Street.
Sacramento, 1330 J Street.
Sacramento, 1106 Second Street.
Salinas, 7 Natividad Street.
San Bernardino, 352 Court Street.
San Diego, 1165 Front Street.
San Fernando, 132 North Maclay Street.
San Francisco, 1690 Mission Street.
San Francisco (commercial and professional), 154 Sansome Street.
San Jose, 393 South Second Street.
San Luis Obispo, 967 Osos Street.
San Mateo, 15 B Street.
San Pedro, 250 West Seventh Street.
San Rafael, 1557 Fourth Street.
Santa Ana, 501 West Fifth Street.
Santa Barbara, 22 East Victoria Street.
Santa Cruz, 23 Front Street.
Santa Maria, 310 West Main Street.
Santa Monica, 1558 Fifth Street.
Santa Rosa, 501 Third Street.
Sonora, 811 North Washington Street.
South San Francisco, 215 Linden Avenue.
Stockton, 201 North San Joaquin Street.
Susanville, 800 Lassen Street.
Torrance, 1927 Carson Street.
Turlock, 138 South Center Street.
Ukiah, 20 Smith Street.
Vallejo, 515 Marin Street.
Van Nuys, 14529 Sylvan Street.
Ventura, 53 South California Street.
Visalia, 119 North Church Street.
Watsonville, 21 West Lake Avenue.
Whittier, 214 West Philadelphia Street.



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

FARM PRODUCTS

INFORMATION STATIONS
1 INDIO
2 BAKERSFIELD
3 PACHECO PASS
MAIN HIGHWAYS

Crops are shown in general locations only. This map is not to be taken as assurance that work exists in any given locality. Ask attendants at Department Information Stations or Local Offices for latest information as to the working conditions.

CRESCENT CITY
HAY
97
POTATOES
HAY
99
299
395
HAY
HAY
POTATOES
OLIVES
HAY
HOPS
WHEAT
BARLEY
HAY
RICE
CORN
PEACHES
40
PEARS
OLIVES
SUGAR BEETS
PEARS
GRAPES
HOPS
APPLES
OATS
PLUMS
STRAWBERRIES
HAY
BEETS
PRUNES
40
SUGAR BEETS
CORN
POTATOES
ASPARAGUS
CHERRIES
TOMATOES
GRAPES
SAN FRANCISCO
50
BARLEY
PEARS
APRICOTS
BEANS
RICE
HAY
ARTICHOKES
PRUNES
SWEET POTATOES
APPLES
152
395
WHEAT
FIGS
GRAPES
PEACHES
COTTON
PEAS
GARLIC
LETTUCE
BARLEY
99
OLIVES
COTTON
101
ORANGES
ALMONDS
COTTON
ORANGES
PEPPERS
AVOCADOS
BEANS
LEMONS
99
ORANGES
CORN
66
WALNUTS
BEANS
BEETS
CABBAGE
POTATOES
LOS ANGELES
ORANGES
HAY
GRAPEFRUIT
2
1
3
BEANS
60
INFORMATION STATIONS
PEPPERS
POTATOES
AVOCADOS
HAY
BEANS
WATERMELONS
LETTUCE
GRAPEFRUIT
COTTON
GRAIN
SORGHUM
SAN DIEGO

NOTE:—See reference in testimony of R. G. Wagenet, on p. 2840, to the information stations shown above, also map showing local offices of State Department of Employment on p. 2840A.

(The following statement and material was later received from Messrs. Huxley and Wagenet and accepted for the record.)

Agricultural Placements, January 1936 to August 1940

GENERAL

The most noticeable characteristic of agricultural placements in California are their large seasonal fluctuations. Normally, placements are at a seasonal low during January and February since there are few crops requiring seasonal farm labor at that time.

The harvesting of vegetables during the spring, especially in the Delta and Coastal region causes agricultural placements to rise sharply and to reach a spring peak about May or early June. After the spring peak there is usually a decrease in agricultural activities until late in July or early August when a heavy demand for farm laborers to harvest deciduous fruits, nuts, hops, grapes, and later cotton, causes placements to rise to a peak for the year in late August or early September. Placements then normally decrease gradually until the following January or February.

This seasonal pattern for placements agrees with seasonal farm-labor requirements as determined in previous studies made by the Giannini Foundation and by the State relief administration. During the year 1936 there were 54,778 complete agricultural placements.

During the first quarter there were 2,732 placements, which was only 5 percent of the total for the year. The first quarter was, of course, a period of normally low activity in agriculture. During the second quarter of 1936 the harvesting of vegetables caused large seasonal demands for labor, while spring ground tilling operations also contributed to the increased demand for labor. The net result of these demands was the making of 12,688 complete placements or 23 percent of the annual total.

During the third quarter of 1936, 20,904 complete placements were made or 38 percent of the annual total. During this quarter the deciduous-fruit areas showed large increases in placements. The last quarter was seasonally a period of decreasing agricultural activity though the high level of placements at the beginning of the quarter and a demand for laborers in the later crops such as cotton kept the total for the quarter only slightly below the previous quarter with nearly 34 percent of the placements for the year being made during the fourth quarter of 1936.

During 1937 there were 63,744 complete placements made and the highest for any year during the period 1936–40.

The quarterly totals during the year were all higher than for the previous year though the quarterly totals bore approximately the same relationships to each other as in 1936.

The reasons for the increase in placements over the previous year appear to be rather complex. Some of the more important factors are herein enumerated.

Most of the year 1937 was a period of increased business activity in most lines. Increased opportunities in other types of employment undoubtedly helped to create a relative scarcity and consequently an increased demand for agricultural labor. This was in contrast to some other years when a surplus of agricultural labor existed in most localities.

Nineteen hundred and thirty seven was a year of exceptionally heavy crops for many farm products. More fruits and vegetables, for example, were canned in California in that year than in any other year according to the reports of the Canner's League.

During the year 1938 only 31,636 complete placements were made in agriculture or less than half of the number made during the previous year.

The most noticeable thing about 1938 agricultural placements is a marked decrease in the amplitude of seasonal fluctuations. During the first quarter of 1938, a period of normally low placements, 4,797 complete placements were made. This was considerably more than in the first quarter of 1936 and only slightly less than the first quarter of 1937. During the succeeding three quarters of 1938 there was surprisingly little difference between quarters in the number of placements; 7,986 placements were made in the second quarter, 9,885 placements in the third quarter, and 8,968 placements during the fourth quarter.

The explanation for the low level of placements has sometimes been attributed to the pressure of unemployment-insurance activities causing less emphasis to be placed upon farm-placement activities.

Although this may be a contributing factor it does not seem to afford a complete explanation. During the first quarter of 1938, when the pressure of claims activities was the greatest, farm placements were about the same as the average in the 2 preceding years.

More important reasons can perhaps be found in economic and social factors: The year 1938 was, especially during the first 9 months, a period of depressed business activity with the result that many more persons were willing to accept farm work than in the previous year. The production of a number of crops requiring large numbers of seasonal laborers was below the previous year. The Canner's League, for example, reports that the amount of fruits and vegetables canned in California in 1938 was 38 percent below the previous year. Another important factor was the continued immigration of farm laborers from other States, especially the Dust Bowl States. The result of this immigration is to add gradually to the number of agricultural laborers in California. Though the influence of this immigration was undoubtedly felt in 1937, the comparatively high level of business conditions and the large crops undoubtedly minimized the noticeable effect of the agricultural migrants from other States and their effect on the agricultural labor market.

Placements in the year 1938, however, felt the combined impact of ever-increasing numbers of migrants coming into California, the effect of residents thrown out of work by the 1938 recession seeking agricultural work in the absence of other work, and the effect of a decrease in the harvest yield in a number of crops.

The result of all these factors was a large surplus of agricultural labor in most localities and, consequently, hiring on the spot was sufficient to meet most labor demands of farm operators.

During 1939 there were 38,864 complete agricultural placements made.

The factors mentioned in the previous year still appeared to have a depressing influence on farm placements.

Placements totaled 2,281 during the first quarter of 1939. This figure, although much below the first quarter of the 2 preceding years, was only slightly below the 1936 figure.

During the second quarter, placements rose to 12,137; which was approximately 50 percent above 1938 and not greatly different from the second quarters of 1936 and 1937.

During the third and fourth quarters of 1939 complete agricultural placements totaled 15,666 and 8,780, respectively. Placements were above the previous year in the third quarter and nearly the same as in 1938 during the fourth quarter. Agricultural placements, however, appear to show the effect of a large surplus of agricultural labor, especially in the deciduous fruit, grape, and cotton areas of the San Joaquin Valley, where perhaps a majority of agricultural migrants from the Dust Bowl have settled. The effect of the European war has been a depressing one on many California crops, since the export market for many fruit and nut products has been an important one. Though the effect of this factor upon 1939 crops has not been ascertained, it would appear to have some bearing on the demand for farm labor.

Placements during the first quarter of 1940 were approximately the same as in the previous year.

During the second quarter, however, complete agricultural placements were only 6,657, nearly 10,000 lower than in the same quarter of the previous year. This decrease may be largely due to the extremely small harvested vegetable crop in some areas, especially in the Delta region, where normally large numbers of placements are made during the spring. The apricot crop, also, was only 25 to 30 percent of normal in many sections.

Complete agricultural placements were used in this analysis since they represent the only complete series for the period studied.

Records of supplemental agricultural placements have been kept since January 1, 1938.

Supplemental placements show an ever-increasing proportion of all agricultural placements. The seasonal pattern for supplemental agricultural placements is approximately the same as for complete placements though the fluctuation appears to be of greater magnitude for the short period for which data are available.

Agricultural placements by quarter, January 1936–August 1940

	Total	Complete	Supplemental
1936			
January, February, March		2,732	
April, May, June		12,688	
July, August, September		20,904	
October, November, December		18,454	
Total		54,778	
1937			
January, February, March		6,402	
April, May, June		13,713	
July, August, September		24,516	
October, November, December		19,113	
Total		63,744	
1938			
January, February, March	5,575	4,797	778
April, May, June	9,434	7,986	1,448
July, August, September	13,975	9,885	4,090
October, November, December	14,046	8,968	5,078
Total	43,030	31,636	11,394
1939			
January, February, March	2,982	2,281	701
April, May, June	16,199	12,137	4,062
July, August, September	24,506	15,666	8,840
October, November, December	15,089	8,780	6,309
Total	58,776	38,864	19,912
1940			
January, February, March	2,843	2,193	650
April, May, June	6,657	4,534	2,123
July, August	14,360	4,759	9,601
8 months' total	23,860	11,486	12,374

Year	Total	Complete	Supplementary
1936		54,778	
1937		63,744	
1938	43,030	31,636	11,394
1939	58,776	38,864	19,912
1940 (8 months' total)	23,860	11,486	12,374

TABLE I.[1]—*Persons seeking agricultural work by years of agricultural experience in California—For workers stopping at the Indio, Bakersfield, and Pacheco Pass Information Stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Years' experience in California	Workers		Years' experience in California	Workers	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Total	2,381	100.0	3 years	82	3.4
			4 years	30	1.3
Less than 1	771	32.4	5 and over	1,144	48.1
1 year	115	4.8	Not given	189	7.9
2 years	50	2.1			

[1] These tables do not include similar service given agricultural workers at all local offices in farm areas.

Table II.—*Persons seeking agricultural work classified by years of agricultural experience in California and by place of origin—For persons interviewed at the Indio, Bakersfield, and Pacheco Pass Agricultural Information Stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940*

Place of origin	Total	Years' agricultural experience in California						
		Less than 1	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 or more	Not given
Total all places of origin	2,381	771	115	50	82	30	1,144	189
California	827	0	6	6	33	3	767	12
Other than California	1,228	762	107	42	39	18	205	55
Texas	250	149	32	13	5	5	26	20
Oklahoma	248	172	26	14	13	6	11	6
Arizona	248	187	20	5	5	0	19	12
Mexico	109	0	0	0	0	0	102	7
Arkansas	85	50	4	3	13	3	9	3
Other [1]	288	204	25	7	3	4	38	7
Origin not given	326	9	2	2	10	9	172	122

[1] No other place of origin showed more than 36 persons.

Table III.—*Total number of parties calling at agricultural information stations, June 3–Aug. 31, 1940, by California residence and type of work sought* [1]

	Total number of parties	Parties seeking work in—		Parties not seeking work
		Agriculture	Other	
Total, all stations	1,189	942	84	163
California residents	583	534	49	0
California nonresidents	396	371	25	0
Residence unknown	210	37	10	163

[1] Party means the group in an automobile, or 1 or more persons traveling together on foot. California resident is defined, for purposes of this study, as one who has spent the greater part of the past 2 years in California.

Average wage rates paid to hired farm labor by States, Jan. 1, 1931–Oct. 1, 1940, per day without board

	Jan. 1	Apr. 1	July 1	Oct. 1
United States average:				
1931	$1.87	$1.80	$1.73	$1.59
1932	1.40	1.35	1.23	1.19
1933	1.06	1.05	1.12	1.25
1934	1.21	1.27	1.30	1.34
1935	1.26	1.34	1.41	1.47
1936	1.37	1.43	1.54	1.59
1937	1.51	1.58	1.87	1.83
1938	1.55	1.63	1.70	1.69
1939	1.53	1.53	1.59	1.57
1940	1.55	1.55	1.62	----------
California:				
1931	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.60
1932	2.45	2.35	2.10	2.00
1933	1.80	1.70	1.85	2.15
1934	2.10	2.15	2.30	2.40
1935	2.30	2.35	2.50	2.50
1936	2.50	2.50	2.60	2.70
1937	2.70	2.80	3.10	3.20
1938	3.00	2.95	2.95	2.80
1939	2.75	2.80	2.80	2.85
1940	2.85	2.85	2.85	----------

Average wage rates paid to hired farm labor by States, Jan. 1, 1931–Oct. 1, 1940, per day without board—Continued

	Jan. 1	Apr. 1	July 1	Oct. 1
Iowa:				
1931	$2.45	$2.45	$2.30	$2.05
1932	1.70	1.65	1.45	1.35
1933	1.20	1.20	1.25	1.35
1934	1.25	1.45	1.40	1.50
1935	1.35	1.55	1.75	1.95
1936	1.60	1.80	2.05	2.00
1937	1.75	2.00	2.30	2.50
1938	1.95	2.15	2.30	2.30
1939	2.00	2.15	2.35	2.35
1940	1.95	2.15	2.35	----------
Kansas:				
1931	2.35	2.25	2.25	1.80
1932	1.60	1.60	1.50	1.40
1933	1.25	1.25	1.40	1.40
1934	1.40	1.40	1.65	1.45
1935	1.35	1.50	1.75	1.65
1936	1.50	1.55	2.10	1.80
1937	1.65	1.70	2.40	2.05
1938	1.75	1.80	2.10	1.95
1939	1.70	1.75	2.15	1.90
1940	1.65	1.75	2.15	----------
Oklahoma:				
1931	1.50	1.40	1.35	1.20
1932	1.10	1.05	1.00	1.00
1933	.95	.90	1.00	1.25
1934	1.15	1.15	1.20	1.15
1935	1.10	1.15	1.30	1.30
1936	1.20	1.20	1.35	1.35
1937	1.30	1.30	1.75	1.55
1938	1.35	1.35	1.60	1.45
1939	1.35	1.35	1.55	1.45
1940	1.35	1.35	1.50	----------
Texas:				
1931	1.40	1.30	1.30	1.20
1932	1.05	1.00	.90	.95
1933	.85	.85	.90	1.10
1934	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.15
1935	1.10	1.10	1.20	1.20
1936	1.15	1.15	1.30	1.35
1937	1.25	1.25	1.40	1.45
1938	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.30
1939	1.25	1.25	1.30	1.30
1940	1.25	1.25	1.30	----------
Arkansas:				
1931	1.10	1.05	1.05	1.00
1932	.95	.85	.70	.75
1933	.70	.70	.75	.85
1934	.85	.85	.90	.90
1935	.90	.90	.90	.90
1936	.90	.95	.95	1.05
1937	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.15
1938	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
1939	1.00	1.05	1.05	1.05
1940	1.00	1.05	1.05	----------

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TESTIMONY OF MISS BETTE O'NEILL, MAR VISTA, CALIF.

Mr. Sparkman. Your name is Bette O'Neill?

Miss O'Neill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sparkman. Speak up so the reporter can hear you. What is your address, Miss O'Neill?

Miss O'Neill. Box 271, Mar Vista, Calif.

Mr. Sparkman. How old are you?

Miss O'Neill. Nineteen.

Mr. Sparkman. How long have you been in California?

Miss O'Neill. About a year and a half.

Mr. Sparkman. Are you here with your family?

Miss O'Neill. My mother and my brother.

Mr. Sparkman. Where is your father?

Miss O'Neill. I think he is in Michigan.

Mr. Sparkman. Your mother and father are separated?

Miss O'Neill. Divorced.

Mr. Sparkman. Just three of you in your family?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. I understand you were born in Illinois and later lived in Michigan, is that correct?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. After your mother obtained a divorce, what did the family do?

Miss O'Neill. Well, my brother and mother and I went down to Florida. We had been planning to go down there and we stayed there until just before Christmas. Then we——

Mr. Sparkman (interrupting). Christmas, but how long ago?

Miss O'Neill. That was in 1935.

Mr. Sparkman. Christmas of 1935?

Miss O'Neill. Yes. From there we thought we would go down to Key West, but it looked so far we decided to go to Texas where most of mother's relatives were. We went to Texas and got there in January and stayed about 2 years. We left in 1937, July 1937, and from there we went back to Michigan to try to collect alimony that my father was supposed to pay mother. We went back to Michigan and stayed there. I stayed there in 1937 and up to August 1938, and then I went to my aunt's home, which is in Seattle, Wash., to go to school with her and live with her. Mother and Richard stayed in Michigan.

Mr. Sparkman. Richard is your brother?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. They stayed in Michigan how long?

Miss O'Neill. Three more months.

Mr. Sparkman. And you went to Seattle, Wash., and went to school?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. How long did you stay there?

Miss O'Neill. I stayed there 7 months and mother and Richard came out to Oregon. My father had gone to Oregon after we came back to Michigan, and we went there. The lawyer told us to go there and try to get the alimony there. She had to stay there 90 days. I lived with my aunt, and she, Richard and my mother were in Portland, Oreg. My father had a grand jury hearing or something, and that didn't do any good, so my father went back to Michigan and I came down into Oregon in March 1939 with mother. We bought a trailer there before the money gave out, in Portland, and then we came down to Los Angeles.

Mr. Sparkman. Now, let me see, you had a court proceeding in Oregon in an effort to collect the alimony that your father owed to your mother?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Failing in that the family bought a trailer and came to southern California?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Now, when was that?

Miss O'Neill. We got here—I think it was in April. I am not sure. Anyway it was 1939.

Mr. Sparkman. February 1939?

Mrs. Davis. We arrived in California on April 7th.

Mr. Sparkman. Is that your mother?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

The Chairman. Perhaps you would like to come up here.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. JEAN DAVIS

Mr. Sparkman. Will you give your name?

Mrs. Davis. Mrs. Davis; Jean Davis. We left there July 1937.

Mr. Sparkman. You left Texas July 1937?

Mrs. Davis. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. You came here February 1?

Mrs. Davis. April. We left in March, from Portland, Oreg., in the trailer, and came here and arrived at the border on April 7, 1939.

Mr. Sparkman. Well, then, did you come straight on to Los Angeles?

Mrs. Davis. Yes. We thought we would never reach it.

Mr. Sparkman. What schooling did you have?

Miss O'Neill. I finished the eleventh grade.

Mr. Sparkman. The last schooling you had in Washington was in the eleventh grade?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Well then, have you had any special training?

Miss O'Neill. Yes. I came down here and I have gone to several dramatic schools and have been in many of the theaters. I appeared in one and was supposed to get a salary but I didn't.

Mr. Sparkman. Did you have a purpose in coming to Los Angeles?

Miss O'Neill. Oh, yes. I wanted—I have always wanted to be an actress ever since I can remember. I wanted to go either to New York or to Hollywood, and Hollywood was chosen as I was out here. I came out to Hollywood.

Mr. Sparkman. In other words, it was nearer to Hollywood than it was to New York?

Miss O'Neill. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Did you try to get work as soon as you got here?

Miss O'Neill. Yes; we did. We didn't have much luck. We went to one employment agency and applied for work and they told us that they had such a long waiting list that it wouldn't do any good. They only had household work, domestic work. We even put our names on the list.

Mr. Sparkman. Well, how did you happen to go to these dramatic schools?

Miss O'Neill. Well, I didn't know how else to go about getting into the movies or the radio. It is so hard to make contacts. You have to have an agent here in Hollywood before you get anywhere. You can't go into the studios like you could 10 or maybe a little more years ago when you could go in and speak for yourself. Now you have to have an agent.

The best way to get an agent is that they always want to see you in something—or most of them do—so you have to get in the theaters.

I didn't know how, when we first came in here—I didn't know much about anything, I was so green—we went to some schools that I learned later were just rackets.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How did you come in contact with those schools? Did you see ads in the papers or magazines?

Miss O'NEILL. The first one, we saw an ad in the paper, and that was a racket we found out later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did you go to it?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. For how long?

Miss O'NEILL. About 3 months.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What did you have to pay?

Miss O'NEILL. $75 apiece.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Both of you went?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes.

Mrs. DAVIS. We took a radio course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did they promise to get work for you?

Miss O'NEILL. No; they didn't.

Mrs. DAVIS. They did orally.

Miss O'NEILL. Orally; yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They led you to believe that they would?

Miss O'NEILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But they did not put it in writing?

Miss O'NEILL. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, did they make any effort to place you after you finished?

Miss O'NEILL. No. The head of the school told me that I would be on the radio within 2 weeks after I started there, getting about $5 a week, or something. I don't remember exactly what he said; and, being perfectly green, we believed him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You were not on the radio?

Miss O'NEILL. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Never did at any time?

Miss O'NEILL. I merely went on there—they had a skit every Sunday for a while on KMTR. They had a little dramatic skit to advertise their studios and I was on that for several Sundays.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Get any pay for that?

Miss O'NEILL. No. That was merely to get more suckers. The school said it was for experience on the air.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You were helping them recruit others?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes, but I did not realize it until later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You said you had worked with the Little Theater on a few occasions?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did you get paid for that?

Miss O'NEILL. Oh, no. We had to pay them. I was supposed to get paid and appeared in "Satan is a Lady" at the Wilshire-Ebell Theater. I had a contract for that. I was supposed to get four-and-a-third of the box office receipts but the man turned out to be a failure as a producer, and he had a hard time paying the theater. I got back half of what I paid him to help the show along. The actors and actresses in the show paid a little bit. He had some society women backing it. Mother got back all that she put in.

We went to the labor commissioner and they got it back for us, except I didn't get my salary or percentage of box-office receipts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You mean he required you to help finance the show and then you were to get paid back after it was produced?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes; and a salary.

Mrs. DAVIS. He promised $75, at least.

Miss O'NEILL. $75 a week.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Where have you been living during that time?

Miss O'NEILL. When we first came in here we stopped at a trailer camp at Burbank. We didn't stay there long.

Mrs. DAVIS. Until May 7, and then we went to Culver City.

Miss O'NEILL. And stayed there until the end of September. Then we went down to where we have been in a trailer ever since. We have been down just near the county line, near Venice, just outside the Venice line.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did you still have the same trailer you bought in Oregon?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And were living in it?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What about your brother? Is he working?

Miss O'NEILL. He is staying at the Hollywood Guild.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What is the Hollywood Guild?

Miss O'NEILL. Well, it is supposed to be a place where they help feed down-and-out actors and actresses. I guess there are other people. I don't know much about it. We applied for Federal aid and as we weren't residents of California and we have lost our residence in Michigan, why, they wouldn't take us and couldn't send us back, so they sent us to the Hollywood Guild and we have been getting our meals there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Having been gone from Michigan for more than a year you lost your residence there?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You never got it in Oregon?

Miss O'NEILL. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And not having been in California 5 years you are not residents of——

Miss O'NEILL (interrupting). Any State.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You are not residents anywhere?

Miss O'NEILL. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the legal sense of the word?

Miss O'NEILL. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You are American citizens?

Miss O'NEILL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But from the standpoint of help you are not citizens of any State?

Miss O'NEILL. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, have you had any relief from any organizations?

Miss O'NEILL. The Hollywood Guild helped us. They paid our rent for a month and they have been giving us our meals, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mrs. Davis, what kind of a place is the Hollywood Guild?

Mrs. DAVIS. It is a charitable organization.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is an association for the purpose of helping actors and actresses who are in distress?

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes; who are in distress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do you have to be members of it?

Miss O'NEILL. No, so they tell us. They just tell them about you and you give references from different people who have known you.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Have you looked for any other line of work?

Miss O'NEILL. Well, I applied at the N. Y. A. just about 3 weeks ago. They told me to do that at the Hollywood Guild and he thought he could get me a job in a State employment office.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You don't know any other work except dramatics?

Miss O'NEILL. No. In Michigan, while we were there, I picked peaches for 2 weeks. We were dismissed after a foreign-looking man called twice and talked privately to the owner of the orchard. The man who drove a truck through the orchard picking up baskets of peaches said we picked more and faster than the men in another part of the orchard.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You don't do stenographic work?

Miss O'NEILL. No. I took typing and I can type about 30 or 40 words a minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You ought to push that up to about 50 because they need lots of typists now.

Miss O'NEILL. Yes; I know.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You are still hoping to get work?

Miss O'NEILL. I am going to if I get to be old and gray, if I have to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I admire your spirit. I hope you are successful, somehow or other. I rather believe in the old saying that where there is a will there is a way and so I hope you find it.

Miss O'NEILL. I hope so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The way has been postponed quite a while, though, has it not?

Miss O'NEILL. I should say it has.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be a good idea for you to take shorthand, and there is a great demand for comptometer operators.

Miss O'NEILL. Well, if you postpone your way too long and go off on so many of these byways, why it takes so much of your time that if you really go for that you have to keep at it all the time. I have an agent who wants to see me in something. I have two theaters that I am going to see in a very few days and play there, and I don't have to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Nowadays it takes travel on a good many byways to get to the main road. We thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rubinow.

TESTIMONY OF S. G. RUBINOW, ADMINISTRATOR, CALIFORNIA STATE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rubinow, give your name and in what capacity you appear, and I think you have an engagement.

Mr. RUBINOW. S. G. Rubinow.

The CHAIRMAN. In what capacity do you appear here, for the record?

Mr. RUBINOW. Administrator, California State Relief Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. You have already filed a statement with us, haven't you?

Mr. RUBINOW. Yes; I have. I am filing it now, Congressman Tolan, and it is merely a factual presentation with no interpretations or conclusions. Then in addition I have prepared a very brief statement, a general statement that I would like to present to this committee, and then in addition to that we have three of our bureau chiefs here who are technically qualified to answer any questions you might have to ask. I am not because I am merely a layman.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anything outside of your statement and report? Was there any oral statement that you wanted to make at this time?

Mr. RUBINOW. I would like to make this general statement, which will not take more than 5 minutes, and it includes some recommendations for legislative action.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we would like to hear.

Mr. RUBINOW. Although they are very general in character. Then will you call on the technical witnesses representing the State relief administration for such questions as you would like to ask?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

MIGRATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RUBINOW (reading). Interstate migration is a phase of the general economic problem of unemployment. Men, women, and their families migrate from one section of the United States to other sections, and from State to State, to look for work which does not exist.

The desire to find work, to make a living, and to improve one's economic position are the forces responsible for migration. All other influences can be disregarded completely because they are negligible.

Therefore, the migration of destitute citizens is a national and not a State or sectional problem alone and must be treated, for its solution, from a national viewpoint in which Federal and State governments participate jointly and bear joint responsibility.

The number one problem of modern society is unemployment. This problem is not political. It is purely economic. Men and women must be given an opportunity to work. There is no other answer.

If private initiative and private enterprise cannot provide work, it then becomes the responsibility of Government to provide for its destitute citizens on a scale which is comparable, at least, to the minimum American standard of living.

This is not only imperative from the viewpoint of destitute citizens but equally so from the viewpoint of those who are engaged in productive work and who maintain themselves by their work.

Government has the same responsibility to its citizens as they do to their Government. No economic situation can be viewed with safety which permits millions of its citizens to have no legal residence and to whom citizenship has no permanent civic and economic significance.

The effect of such a condition upon the body politic is serious and dangerous.

Migration of destitute citizens merely means the crossing of artifical geographical boundaries between States. A destitute citizen of Oklahoma who migrates to California is still an American citizen, no matter what the rules and regulations may be which define his legal residence in California. If California cannot absorb, through private enterprise, the destitute migrant from Oklahoma, and if Oklahoma cannot provide opportunities to enable the Oklahoma migrant to remain in Oklahoma, the time then comes when it is the duty and the responsibility of the National Government to take adequate care of its homeless and citizenless citizens.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE UNIFORM

It has been generally acknowledged that artificial trade barriers, which stop the flow of goods and services, are uneconomic and unsound from the viewpoint of national welfare. Human trade barriers, caused by lack of uniformity in legal residence requirements, as between States, or which deprive citizens of their citizenship, merely because there is no available work for such citizens, are equally unsound and uneconomic in terms of general welfare.

There should be, therefore, a standardization of residence requirements, for the States, affecting public assistance by the States to those of its citizens who cannot find work and who must look to government for financial assistance.

ADMINISTRATION OF RELIEF AGENCIES

The time has also arrived where there must be greater centralization in the administration of agencies furnishing public financial assistance to destitute citizens and representing all categories.

There must be a minimum of administrative cost and a maximum of benefits to recipients, irrespective of the nature of the programs.

Because the problem of destitute citizens is a national one and not a State or a local problem, the type of administration which must be created to handle this problem is one which should emphasize a single State agency, operating through a national agency, and financed by State and National governments on a proportionate basis in terms of population, per capita wealth, and other factors.

It is also most desirable to enact legislation which will prevent exploitation of destitute citizens. This is particularly necessary in the field of agricultural employment, both for the benefit of agricultural producers and farm migratory workers.

FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE NEEDED

States of origin, States of destination, and the Federal Government should be given the opportunity of participating jointly in a highly efficient farm placement service which will direct the flow of farm migrants in a rational manner and which will maintain its operations in line with actual needs of farm operators for farm labor.

TEMPORARY FEDERAL DOLE

While it is recognized that the dole is the least desirable method of keeping alive destitute citizens, because there is no substitute for work and because the dole eliminates man's most necessary and most natural impulse, the desire for work, nevertheless, until work can be found through private initiative and enterprise or through governmental works programs, every effort should be made, through joint State and Federal participation, to increase the purchasing power of destitute citizens.

Much has been said in the past few years on the necessity of developing the American market for American agriculture and American industry.

The largest single handicap to a stabilized and improved American market for American industry and agriculture is lack of purchasing or consuming power.

For example, while the United States Army has a food allowance of 15 cents per meal per person at wholesale prices, millions of persons on relief and in low-income groups are living on an average of 5 cents per meal at retail prices.

The operations of the Federal food-stamp plan, for which Congress has made appropriations with unanimous approval, has raised the 5-cent meal to relief recipients to 7½ cents.

Studies of income groups throughout the United States show that two-thirds of the families in America, comprising 80,000,000 persons, have been trying to live on an average cash income of approximately $70 per month for an entire family.

That amount is not sufficient to turn the wheels of industry or to give agriculture even the cost of production.

There is greater need than ever for economic planning, by States, by regions, and for the United States as a whole, through which to work out an American pattern of life and living which will absorb destitute citizens and enable them to become assimilated within communities which can open up new opportunities for them.

Such planning would not be a violation of States rights or of the rights of local communities; but, on the other hand, would be a great contributing factor toward the stabilization of the physical and human resources of the United States and the best known manner in which to preserve and enhance American democracy.

That is our general statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I want that to go into the record verbatim. This report on the problem of interstate migration is a complete report of the way in which this problem affects your relief set-up in the State of California?

Mr. RUBINOW. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. We will mark that as an exhibit.

(The document referred to was received and appears below.)

STATEMENT OF S. G. RUBINOW, ADMINISTRATOR, CALIFORNIA STATE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION, PREPARED BY BUREAU OF STATISTICS, E. M. COOPER, CHIEF

THE PROBLEM OF INTERSTATE MIGRATION AS IT AFFECTS THE CALIFORNIA STATE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

The State Relief Administration of California is the agency of the State which administers unemployment relief to the employable unemployed who are not cared for under the program of the Federal Work Projects Administration.

The State relief administration extends aid to the unemployed entirely from State funds and through its own offices located throughout the State. The county welfare departments in the State of California do not enter directly into the picture of unemployment relief.

The State relief administration was first created as the State emergency relief administration in the spring of 1933 to distribute funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the county agencies. The Governor appointed an emergency relief administrator as the executive officer of the agency and an emergency relief commission to aid the administrator in determining relief policies.

In July 1933, the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator appointed the State emergency relief administration as the executive body to administer the distribution of Federal funds in California. The State emergency relief administration continued to act in that capacity until Federal funds were withdrawn and the Work Projects Administration created in 1933. Since that time the State emergency relief administration (now the State relief administration) has cared for the unemployed for whom security wage employment is not available on projects of the Work Projects Administration, either because of ineligibility to the Work Projects Administration or because of lack of sufficient quota by the Work Projects Administration.

The State relief administration is also the State agency which administers a number of other Federal programs in California. It is the certifying agency of persons eligible to Works Projects Administration and National Youth Administration. It supervises enrollment of boys in the Civilian Conservation Corps in California. It conducted the college student aid and emergency education programs prior to the establishment of the National Youth Administration. Together with the Work Projects Administration and the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation, it has distributed millions of dollars worth of surplus commodities in California. It operates the school lunch program for needy children. The State relief administration now administers the Federal stamp plan (food and cotton) in California which is gradually expanding and taking the place of the surplus commodity distribution program.

The State relief administration and the transient programs.—In the depths of the 1932 and 1933 depression California localities were overburdened with care of their own residents needing aid and were legally not responsible for those persons who did not meet the residence requirements under the State's Indigent Act, the most important provision of which required 3 years of independent residence in the State before application for relief.

"In the small cities, transients were frequently forced to move on by the police. In the large cities, some shelter and food were given by public agencies but the missions and other religious types of agencies gave most of this limited assistance. Conditions were wretched. 'Flop houses' were overcrowded, food was poor, and sanitary facilities were inadequate. Transients and homeless residents were treated alike in the shelters, men and boys mingled, and there was no separation of the diseased from the healthy. Those not accommodated in the shelters often found a night's lodging in the city jails or a longer residence in the 'shanty towns' and 'jungles' that sprang up on the outskirts of the cities. Families and single men lived partly on the limited public charity available and partly from begging and 'panhandling,' or even from petty theft." [1]

In response to such conditions prevailing throughout the country, the Federal Government accepted responsibility for the care of persons who had been in the State less than 1 year through the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933.

"Financed with Federal funds, a transient program was established by the State relief administration beginning in September 1933. Conforming to Federal policy, the first task was to provide sufficient shelters in the various cities to accommodate the homeless, and then to establish work camps to which were sent transients who agreed to accept care and a nominal cash wage in exchange for work on useful public projects. Families were cared for through work and direct relief provided by family bureaus located in the cities. By April 1935, the system of transient units throughout the State included 17 family service bureaus, 39 camps for men and boys, and 17 shelters. In addition, the Transient Division supervised 18 camps for homeless residents of California.

---

[1] Review of activities of the State Relief Administration of California, 1933–35, p. 28.

"Although the program sought by means of work, education, and recreation to rehabilitate the transient men, their persistent tendency to move on from shelters and camps nullified much of the constructive effort. This could not be stopped because of the ease with which the men could find temporary shelter in the cities under assumed names. Many of the boys also continued migration even after being enrolled in one of the boys' camps. Only the families showed stability, lacking inducements to travel on and generally remaining in the cities.

"Health problems were common among the transients, particularly venereal diseases among the men. Mental and emotional disturbances also were a common result of the unstable conditions accompanying migration. Temporarily, at least, the camp program restored most of the men to more normal living habits.

"The transient program was liquidated between September and December 1935, in accordance with Federal policy to either return transients to their States of residence for employment by the Works Progress Administration, or to absorb as many as possible on the projects of the California Works Progress Administration. The acceptance of new applicants was sharply curtailed during this period when attempts were made to deal individually with each case already under care. However, many men continued to leave camps and shelters for the road. As a result of this circumstance plus the influx of transients from other States during the usual winter migration, and the loss of employment by many transients engaged in seasonal agricultural work, the uncared-for population increased considerably. By the end of the year, 'jungles' and 'shanty towns,' begging and 'panhandling' were once more in evidence. Although they were on a smaller scale than in 1933, they still were serious symptoms of what appears to be a chronic transient problem in California." [2]

Further important details concerning the nature and size of the transient program in California are presented in a "Review of Activities of the State Relief Administration of California, 1933–35," chapters VIII and IX, pages 167 to 200.

LEGISLATION AND RELIEF POLICIES CONCERNING RESIDENCE

Under the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration established a transient division to extend grants to States for transient relief, providing assistance to persons lacking 1 year's residence in the State of application for aid. Individuals who had been in a given State more than 1 year were considered a responsibility of that State under the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933.

For a number of years, to be eligible for indigent aid through the county welfare departments of California, a person had to have 3 years of independent residence, that is, he must have resided in California for 3 years or more intending to establish his home here; and during this period he must not have received any public or private assistance other than from legally responsible relatives.

Cooperating with the Federal relief programs the State relief commission, appointed by the Governor, established a 1-year residence rule for aid to the unemployed from State funds. This conformed with the Federal plan of accepting as a Federal responsibility those persons who lacked 1 year's residence, leaving to the State responsibility for persons of more than 1 year's residence.

In its relief activities, California, therefore, established a transient program separate from its resident program. Persons were cared for under the resident program out of State and Federal funds if they had been in California for 1 year or more. Those persons who had been in the State for less than 1 year were cared for out of Federal funds under the transient program which was liquidated in 1935.

However, since the State Emergency Relief Administration still had a residue of the Federal funds granted to California for this purpose, persons who had less than 1 year's residence continued to be accepted for aid by the State Relief Administration. Effort was made to verify legal residence and, upon receipt of authorization from the State of residence, these persons were returned thereto.

---

[2] Review of Activities, op. cit., pp. 28–29.

If the relief recipient refused to return to his State of residence, aid in California was discontinued unless good social reasons existed for the continuance of aid. If a family was without residence in any State, aid was continued indefinitely as long as the family was otherwise eligible for aid from the State relief administration.

In January 1936, this policy was amended to the effect that aid was discontinued to persons upon their refusal to return to legal residence after it had been verified.

In the fall of 1937, with the establishment of the Farm Security Administration grant program, persons lacking 1 year's residence in California and unwilling to return to their place of legal settlement, were referred to the Farm Security Administration for aid. The State relief administration thus extended only temporary aid pending verification of legal residence and return thereto. The Farm Security Administration gave more complete aid to persons lacking 1 year's residence. The Farm Security Administration adopted the policy of transferring cases to the State relief administration upon the completion of 1 year's physical residence in California.

In June 1938 the State relief administration policy became more restrictive. Nonresidents were accepted for aid only if they indicated in advance a willingness to return to legal residence when such residence was verified.

In January 1939 the latter provision was rescinded. Applicants for relief were not required to indicate willingness to return to legal residence in order to receive aid. However, efforts were made to verify legal residence and to return these persons. In March 1939 the Farm Security Administration agreed to continue aid to persons receiving aid under the Farm Security Administration grant program after completion of 1 year's residence; and not to refer them to the State relief administration.

At approximately the same time the State relief administration again decided not to extend aid to persons lacking 1 year's residence unless the family indicated at the time of application willingness to return to its place of legal residence. This policy was again adopted because of lack of adequate funds for operation of the various State relief administration programs.

In February 1940 the California Legislature, in enacting an appropriation bill for the State relief administration, included several residence provisions in the act. The new law denied relief to persons who had not resided continuously in California for a period of at least 3 years, unless such persons had, previous to February 2, 1940, already received aid from the State relief administration or Work Projects Administration. It also specified that nonresidents could be transported to their place of legal settlement with funds available from this appropriation. However, persons once returned to legal residence could not again enter California and receive aid from the State relief administration.

Under this act, the relief commission restricted aid to nonresidents to a maximum of 30 days. The attorney general has interpreted the law to mean that transportation of a nonresident may not be furnished if his legal residence is in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or a foreign country.

In May 1940, the California Legislature, in another appropriation bill again amended the residence requirements in the preceding relief appropriation act. The present act states that none of the appropriation may be extended for the relief of any person who "has not either lived continuously in this State for 5 years, if he began to live in the State of California after June 1, 1940, or lived continuously in the State of California for 3 years, if he began to live in the State of California for 3 years, if he began to live in the State of California on or before June 1, 1940." With respect to aid to nonresidents the following provision was adopted: "* * * the appropriation shall be available for relief pending transportation, but not to exceed 30 days, and for the costs of transportation of a nonresident to any State in which he resides. Every nonresident, who has once received assistance under this subdivision * * * shall not be granted further assistance from the appropriation made by this act."

At the present time, therefore, the State relief administration may not grant aid, other then temporary aid pending return to legal residence, to new applicants who have not resided in California for 3 years or more if they started to reside here prior to June 1, 1940. Persons entering the State after June 1, 1940, may not receive aid for 5 years after the date of entrance.

An illustration of the problems facing the State Relief Administration and County Welfare Departments of California in attempting to work out policies concerning the transient problem is contained in the following letter recently received in reply to an attempt to verify legal residence of a transient applicant for aid in San Diego County.

United Provident Association,
Oklahoma City, Okla., September 11, 1940.

Re Smith—John, Mary.

Mrs. Kathryn Cox,
Social Service Supervisor, State Relief Administration,
Box 310, San Diego, Calif.

My Dear Mrs. Cox: Please refer to your letter of August 24, 1940, regarding the above-named family.

The information which we have secured during this investigation indicates that the John and Mary Smith family have legal settlement in Oklahoma City. You may return them, at your expense, any time prior to August 1, 1941, when their settlement will terminate.

Mr. and Mrs. Smith's son, George Smith, is employed on the Work Projects Administration program. He is unable to send funds for transportation for his parents.

Please advise Mr. Smith that the facilities available for relief in Oklahoma are very inadequate. If Mr. Smith is an able-bodied man and capable of doing manual labor, he would not be eligible for assistance through the United Provident Association or the Salvation Army since these two agencies assist families where the wage earner is temporarily incapacitated. Neither of these agencies accept unemployment cases. Unemployment cases are cared for by the County Welfare Board. That agency has thousands of families on its rolls. Its case load is so large and funds so limited that each family receives a maximum of $2 or $3 a month. In addition, county welfare board cases receive United States Government food stamps redeemable in Federal surplus commodities but these are inadequate for subsistence. Mr. Smith would not be eligible for relief from the American Red Cross unless he is a veteran with a service-connected disability. The only other type of relief available in Oklahoma to able-bodied persons is the Work Projects Administration. At this time the Work Projects Administration rolls are officially closed. There are approximately twenty-eight hundred men in this county who are certified for Work Projects Administration employment, but who have never been assigned to work. Before new applications are taken and new certifications are made, this surplus must be absorbed. If Mr. Smith desires to return to Oklahoma City after being informed of the existing relief conditions in this community, you have our permission to send him here.

Very truly yours,

(Miss) Marie Dorney,
Case worker.

THE VOLUME AND COST OF AID TO NONRESIDENTS

California has had the largest share of the Federal transient population in the United States. During the Federal transient program, between 1933 and 1935, 10 to 13 percent of the national total of persons under care were aided each month in California. The peak number was 38,815 persons under care on February 15, 1935. Table I shows the number of persons cared for under the California transient program as reported to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration the middle of each month during 1934 and 1935. It will be noted that at the peak February 15, 1935, the 38,815 individuals included 23,309 persons from 6,652 families and 15,506 unattached persons.

Table 1.—*Number of unattached and family transients under care of the California transient program, Feb. 15, 1934, to Dec. 16, 1935*

Year and month	Total individuals	Unattached persons			Family individuals	Number of families
		Total	Males	Females		
1934						
Feb. 15	16, 498	8, 702	8, 366	336	7, 796	2, 241
Mar. 15	18, 420	9, 380	8, 991	389	9, 040	2, 562
Apr. 16	19, 511	8, 376	7, 944	432	11, 135	3.080
May 15	18, 585	7, 173	6, 852	321	11, 412	3, 149
June 15	19, 190	7, 717	7, 205	512	11, 473	3, 189
July 16	19, 878	8, 045	7, 545	500	11, 833	3, 334
Aug. 15	19, 444	7, 874	7, 414	460	11, 570	3, 337
Sept. 15	21, 292	8, 801	8, 211	590	12, 491	3, 669
Oct. 15	24, 774	10, 894	10, 262	632	13, 880	4, 061
Nov. 15	28, 537	12, 537	11, 839	698	16, 000	4, 660
Dec. 15	32, 393	14, 199	13, 471	728	18, 194	5, 255

TABLE 1.—*Number of unattached and family transients under care of the California transient program, Feb. 15, 1934, to Dec. 16, 1935*—Continued

Year and month	Total individuals	Unattached persons			Family individuals	Number of families
		Total	Males	Females		
1935						
Jan. 15	35,434	14,713	13,976	737	20,721	5,928
Feb. 15	38,815	15,506	14,708	798	23,309	6,652
Mar. 15	38,390	14,030	13,253	777	24,360	7,028
Apr. 15	37,661	12,696	11,899	797	24.965	7,075
May 15	34,389	9,951	9,125	826	24,438	6,933
June 15	31,117	8,369	7,577	792	22,748	9,494
July 15	30,665	9,060	8,294	766	21,605	6,201
Aug. 15	30,923	8,785	7,973	812	22,138	6,324
Sept. 16	19,865	4,906	4,528	378	14,959	4,067
Oct. 15	12,971	2,481	2,152	329	10,490	2,927
Nov. 15	8,993	1,891	1,669	222	7,102	2,001
Dec. 16	7,225	1,495	1,342	153	5,730	1,485

Source: Mid-month census as reported to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

Following the liquidation of the Federal transient program in 1935, the number of transient cases receiving aid from the State relief administration has been relatively small as a result of the policies concerning aid to nonresidents. At the present time, therefore, the State Relief Administration is giving temporary aid to only 475 transient cases including 1,660 persons.

With the inauguration of the Farm Security Administration grant program, the major portion of nonresidents in need of assistance have been cared for under this program. At the present time, approximately 4,500 cases are being given aid under this grant program of the Farm Security Administration.

During the period July 1933 to June 1940, it is conservatively estimated that more than 300,000 persons received aid within 1 year after they had come to California. This number represents more than 32 percent of the estimated total migration to California of 957,000 persons during the years 1933 to 1939 according to estimates of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare of the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. To these 300,000 persons, aid has been extended from State and Federal funds approximating $13,000,000, exclusive of administrative costs. At the present time, expenditures from State funds for aid and transportation to transient cases approximate $750,000 a year.

Data concerning the size of the transient case load during each month and the amount of relief extended to these cases are presented in table II.

TABLE 2.—*Transient cases aided by State Relief Administration and relief extended to them, June 1933 to August 1940*

Month and year	End of month case load	Cases aided during month	Relief extended
1933			
July	(1)	[2] 9,200	$87,285
August	(1)	[2] 10,500	64,005
September	(1)	[2] 11,600	82,001
October	(1)	[2] 8,500	86,481
November	(1)	[2] 9,100	107,720
December	(1)	[2] 10,300	211,915
1934			
January	(1)	[2] 11,500	242,382
February	[3] 10,943	(1)	208,440
March	[3] 11,942	(1)	261,698
April	[3] 11,456	(1)	393,315
May	[3] 10,322	(1)	[2] 313,400
June	[3] 10,906	(1)	[2] 300,600
July	[3] 11,379	(1)	[2] 278,700
August	[3] 11,211	(1)	[2] 344,100
September	[3] 12,470	(1)	[2] 285,700
October	[3] 14,955	(1)	[2] 351,300
November	[3] 17,197	(1)	[2] 406,900
December	[3] 19,454	(1)	[2] 467,700

[1] Not reported.
[2] Estimated.

TABLE 2.—*Transient cases aided by State Relief Administration and relief extended to them, June 1933 to August 1940*—Continued

Month and year	End of month case load	Cases aided during month	Relief extended
1935			
January	[3] 20,641	(1)	[2] $574,900
February	[3] 22,158	(1)	[2] 453,200
March	[3] 21,058	(1)	[2] 441,000
April	[3] 19,771	(1)	[2] 427,300
May	[3] 16,884	(1)	[2] 405,200
June	[3] 14,863	(1)	[2] 385,700
July	[3] 15,261	(1)	[2] 516,300
August	[3] 15,109	(1)	[2] 437,100
September	[3] 8,973	(1)	[2] 281,200
October	[3] 5,408	(1)	116,783
November	[3] 4,886	(1)	171,347
December	[3] 4,361	(1)	[2] 217,700
1936			
January	(1)	(1)	[2] 228,100
February	(1)	(1)	[2] 107,700
March	(1)	(1)	[2] 131,500
April	[3] 1,439	(1)	65,769
May	[3] 1,327	(1)	59,355
June	[3] 1,062	(1)	37,770
July	941	1,437	42,361
August	971	1,562	41,736
September	1,055	1,596	48,192
October	1,241	1,691	55,771
November	1,487	1,938	55,915
December	1,953	2,405	72,206
1937			
January	2,651	3,435	99,312
February	3,116	3,916	110,948
March	2,269	3,741	125,675
April	1,515	2,775	92,281
May	951	1,676	54,874
June	804	1,434	37,940
July	777	1,353	43,313
August	663	1,168	37,856
September	612	1,010	31,352
October	598	1,019	34,119
November	943	1,347	41,417
December	1,535	2,146	66,149
1938			
January	2,288	2,997	[2] 84,400
February	2,871	(1)	[2] 115,600
March	3,022	(1)	[2] 129,700
April	2,422	(1)	[2] 118,100
May	1,961	(1)	[2] 95,000
June	1,654	(1)	[2] 78,700
July	1,685	(1)	[2] 74,400
August	1,631	(1)	[2] 73,500
September	1,394	(1)	[2] 67,600
October	1,326	(1)	[2] 60,900
November	1,382	(1)	[2] 60,500
December	1,744	(1)	[2] 71,400
1939			
January	1,966	(1)	[2] 83,200
February	2,078	(1)	[2] 89,100
March	2,150	(1)	[2] 91,000
April	1,785	(1)	[2] 83,600
May	1,427	(1)	[2] 67,300
June	1,215	(1)	[2] 55,900
July	1,289	(1)	[2] 53,800
August	1,336	(1)	[2] 55,300
September	1,423	(1)	[2] 58,400
October	1,537	(1)	[2] 62,000
November	1,915	(1)	[2] 72,700
December	2,318	(1)	[2] 90,200
1940			
January	2,566	(1)	[2] 102,200
February	2,256	(1)	[2] 95,800
March	1,472	(1)	[2] 59,200
April	764	(1)	[2] 42,600
May	537	(1)	[2] 24,800
June	567	(1)	[2] 22,100
July	602	(1)	[2] 24,100
Total			12,836,082

[1] Not reported

[2] Estimated.

[3] Midmonthly census.

The fact that persons who have been in the State more than a year, but are still recent migrants, have had a marked effect upon the State relief administration case load, is indicated by an examination of case-load data for individual county offices of the State relief administration since 1937. A graphic presentation of these case-load data for each county is contained in the attached chart.

In view of the fact that a large proportion of those migrating to California were last employed in agriculture, and an even higher proportion turned to agriculture in California for employment, it would be expected that in recent years the State relief administration case load in agricultural counties would have risen more rapidly than in urban counties. This is strikingly the case. The end of February may be taken as representative of the peak of the total State relief administration case load. At the end of February 1937, the total State relief administration case load consisted of 70,397 cases, while at the end of February 1940 it consisted of 112,354 cases, an increase of 60 percent. The combined case loads for the four urban counties—San Francisco, Alameda, Los Angeles, and San Diego—totaled 42,419 at the end of February 1937 and 62,901 at the end of February 1937, an increase of only 48 percent. On the other hand, the combined case load for eight counties of the predominantly agricultural San Joaquin Valley–San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Fresno, Madera, Tulare, Kern, Kings—rose from 5,447 at the end of February 1937 to 20,007 at the end of February 1940, an increase of 267 percent.

The sharp disproportionate rise in the State relief administration case load in agricultural counties is also the result of another and important type of migration, intrastate migration as contrasted to interstate migration. Migration within the State, entirely apart from migration from outside of the State, is necessary to meet peak requirements for labor by several California industries, particularly agriculture. These occur at different dates in different areas. From the attached chart showing individual county case loads, it may be seen that the various counties reached their peak in case load on varying dates. Similarly the low points in case load are also staggered. The fact that relief case loads in the agricultural counties of California tend to be more transitory and less stable than in the urban counties is also indicated by comparative figures indicating average differences between peak and low case loads. For the 3 years 1937, 1938, and 1939, in the above-mentioned agricultural counties, the average low point in case load was 66 percent of the average peak, whereas in the four urban counties it was 24 percent of the average peak. Typical patterns of migration within thy State of California are shown in one of the appended documents—Migratore Labor in California.

Table 3 shows by months the number of cases closed by the State relief administration through the return of transient cases to their States of legal residence for the period December 1935 through June 1940. During this period 25,213 cases, including approximately 83,200 persons, were returned to legal residence at a cost of approximately $600,000. (These figures are included in the number of cases aided and in the relief extended data presented above.)

Table 3.—*Cases closed by State relief administrations because of return to legal residence December 1935 through June 1940*

Month and year:	Number returned
December 1935 through March 1936	1,985
1936	
April	[1] 200
May	191
June	155
July	141
August	159
September	207
October	189
November	205
December	342
1937	
January	361
February	428
March	647
April	533
May	354
June	290
July	227
August	311
September	244
October	231
November	316
December	441

---

[1] Estimated.

TABLE 3.—*Cases closed by State relief administrations because of return to legal residence December 1935 through June 1940*—Continued

Month and year—Con.	Number returned
1938	
January	639
February	807
March	895
April	1,012
May	824
June	790
July	645
August	729
September	579
October	489
November	540
December	707
1939	
January	724
February	565
March	601
April	494
May	457
June	446
July	320
August	408
September	310
October	386
November	467
December	522
1940	
January	657
February	577
March	600
April	378
May	287
June	200
Total	25,213

The above figures pertain only to relief extended to cases during their first year of residence in California. If one were to consider aid extended to recent migrants to the State after they had met the State relief administration residence requirement, the volume of relief extended would be considerably greater. For example, in February 1939, 26 percent of the State relief administration case load consisted of cases and persons who had been in California for less than 3 years. A distribution of the State relief administration case load at that time according to length of residence in California is presented in table 4.

TABLE 4.—*Percentage distribution of family heads of State relief administration cases by length of residence in California, as of Feb. 11, 1939*

Number of years' residence	Number of cases, percent	Number of cases, cumulative percent
Native-born Californians	9.2	9.2
Less than 1 year	2.5	11.7
1	7.7	19.4
2	6.9	26.3
3	4.3	30.6
4	3.5	34.1
5	1.9	36.0
6	2.0	38.0
7	2.3	40.3
8	3.0	43.3
9 to 13	14.1	57.4
14 to 18	17.5	74.9
19 to 28	16.0	90.9
29 to 38	6.6	97.5
More than 38	2.5	100.0
Total	100.0	

The fact that the present transient case load represents a small proportion of the total load of the State relief administration does not mean that the problem resulting from recent migration into California is now negligible. The State relief administration's transient case load is small because—

1. Legislation prohibits State relief administration aid to persons who do not meet the present residence requirements.
2. The Farm Security Administration is giving aid to a number of persons who have no legal residence in California.
3. Most of the persons who migrated to California during the middle of the past decade, when the largest migration occurred, now have California residence and are not classed as transients.

Additional information on the aspects of the migrant problem in California is available in other material presented with this statement to the House Committee on Interstate Migration. This material includes "Review of Activities of the State Relief Administration of California," "Migratory Labor in California," and "Transients in California."

Characteristics of Transient Applicants for Relief, 1936

During the last quarter of 1936, the State relief administration collected information on the background and characteristics of transient persons receiving aid from the State relief administration.

Questionnaires were filled out by case workers for a sample group of applicants throughout the State. Data were tabulated from 1,961 questionnaires. A summary of the information gathered follows:

The transient applicants came largely from the West Central States and from Illinois. The table on page A shows not only the last State in which the transient applicant lived for 1 year or more but also the length of time from the date of beginning their migration to the date of application for relief in California. It will be noted that more than 15 percent of the applicants came from Oklahoma, with Texas and Missouri contributing the next largest proportions—7.5 percent. The other West Central States of Arkansas, Nebraska, and Kansas also contributed significantly. The East Central State of Illinois was the State of origin of 6 percent of the applicants. Outside of the Central States, the States of origin of other significant numbers of these transient applicants were New York, Colorado, and California's neighboring States of Arizona, Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

The table on page A [1] also indicates that most of the transients included in the survey did not leave their homes to come directly to California because 62 percent of the applicants had left their homes 3 months or more prior to the date of their applications for aid in California, and 50 percent had been traveling 4 months or more before they applied for aid in this State. One out of every eight of the applicants had been on the road for 1 year or more before the date of their application for aid from the State relief administration.

It is particularly significant to note from table 6 that 1,845, or 94 percent, of the applicants were native-born American citizens. The nationality of these recent migrants to California is presented in table 6.

Table 6.—*Nationality of the heads of 1,961 Federal transient cases applying for relief at the offices of the State Relief Administration of California during the last quarter of 1936*

Nationality	Number of persons	Total
Native-born		1,845
Foreign-born:		
Austria	2	
Belgium	1	
Canada	4	
Cuba	1	
Czecho-Slovakia	1	
Denmark	3	
England	4	
Germany	4	
Greece	4	
Holland	2	
Italy	6	
Ireland	3	
Mexico	20	
New Zealand	1	
Norway	3	
Persia	1	
Philippine Islands	1	
Poland	2	
Puerto Rico	2	
Portugal	1	
Russia	5	
Serbia	1	
Spain	1	
Spanish-America	2	
Switzerland	1	
Not specified	10	86
Nationality not specified		30
Total		1,961

---

[1] This table as submitted was illegible. It was removed and placed in the committee file.

Industrial classifications of 1,961 Federal transients applying for aid at offices of the State Relief Administration of California, as reported by intake workers

[Data collected during October, November, and December of 1936]

Division and State or section	Total 1	Agriculture 2	Mining 3	Forestry and fishing 4	Manufacturing 5	Construction 6	Transportation and communication 7	Trade 8	Public service 9	Professional service 10	Domestic and personal service 11	Other 12	Industry not specified 13	No industry 14
United States	1,961	525	48	23	192	225	87	228	36	41	292	18	128	118
New England	42				10	6	1	6	3	1	8	1	3	3
Maine	1					1								
New Hampshire	1								1					
Vermont	1									1				
Massachusetts	26				8	3		4	2		6		1	2
Rhode Island	4				1	1					1	1		
Connecticut	9				1	1	1	2			1		2	1
Middle Atlantic	156	13	4	1	30	15	7	26	2	4	33		11	10
New York	95	4	1		20	12	3	21	2	2	18		6	6
New Jersey	17	2			3	2	1	2			5		1	1
Pennsylvania	44	7	3	1	7	1	3	3		2	10		4	3
East North Central	258	29	2	3	43	27	12	49	5	8	40	7	19	14
Ohio	55	5			17	4	2	7	1	2	6	2	4	5
Indiana	26	5			3	8	3	2			4			1
Illinois	113	8	2	1	13	14	3	24	3	4	23	4	10	4
Michigan	49	8		2	10	1	3	11	1	2	5	1	4	1
Wisconsin	15	3					1	5			2		1	3
West North Central	369	101	5	6	33	49	21	41	5	10	49	2	28	19
Minnesota	24	3			1	2	3	3		2	5		5	
Iowa	32	4	2	1	5	4	2	3	1	1	2		3	4
Missouri	148	44	2	5	15	20	5	13	2	4	20		10	8
North Dakota	21	10				1	2	2	1	1	4			
South Dakota	17	5			1	4		2		1	1		2	1
Nebraska	63	23			3	8	6	6	1		9		3	4
Kansas	64	12	1		8	10	3	12		1	8	2	5	2

South Atlantic	60	10	2		6	5	5	9	1	3	11	1	5	2
Delaware	2							2						
Maryland	9				1	2	2	2			1	1		
District of Columbia	4							1			3			
Virginia	4	2	1			1								
West Virginia	6	2	1		1						1			1
North Carolina	8	1			1	1		1		1	2			1
South Carolina	6	1			1		1	1	1		1			
Georgia	11	2			2		2			2	1		2	
Florida	10	2				1		2			2		3	
East South Central	56	13	3		1	9	3	7	6	1	5		5	3
Kentucky	14	2	3			1	1	2	3				1	1
Tennessee	22	5			1	7		3	1		2		2	1
Alabama	15	3				1	2	1	2		3		2	1
Mississippi	5	3						1		1				
West South Central	586	251	16	4	41	52	17	45	7	7	77	5	30	34
Arkansas	106	58	2	3	5	6	2	1	2	1	13		7	6
Louisiana	24	5			3		1	2		2	5	1	2	3
Oklahoma	308	151	14	1	18	26	6	22	2	3	38	2	11	14
Texas	148	37			15	20	8	20	3	1	21	2	10	11
Mountain	290	79	14	2	13	41	15	29	5	3	50	1	15	23
Montana	23	5	2			3	4	3	1		3		2	
Idaho	39	20	1		1	2	1	1	1		6		1	5
Wyoming	7	1	1		1	2	1						1	
Colorado	80	19		1	5	16	2	10	1	1	18		3	4
New Mexico	25	6	2			2	1	4		1	4		3	2
Arizona	66	22	4	1	3	4	3	5			12	1	4	7
Utah	42	5	3		3	12	2	4	2	1	5		1	4
Nevada	8	1	1				1	2			2			1
Pacific	131	28	2	7	14	21	4	16	2	2	19	1	6	9
Washington	81	16	2	4	11	15	2	10	2	1	11		3	4
Oregon	50	12		3	3	6	2	6		1	8	1	3	5
Mexico	2												1	1
Other foreign countries	8	1			1		1			2			3	
United States Territories	3						1						2	

Source: State Relief Administration Form 310.

Occupational classifications of 1,961 transients applying for aid at offices of the State Relief Administration of California, as reported by intake workers

[Data collected during October, November, and December of 1936]

Division and State or section	Total	Professional and kindred workers				Salesmen and related workers	Office workers	Skilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Un-skilled workers, non-farm	Un-skilled workers farm	Service workers	Not specified	Inexperienced	Unemployable
		Total	Professional technical	Proprietors, managers, officials	Farm operators and owners										
United States	1,961	149	50	20	79	97	62	267	243	267	421	266	65	91	33
New England	42	3	1	2		1	2	9	5	10		7	1	3	1
Maine	1									1					
New Hampshire	1	1		1											
Vermont	1	1	1												
Massachusetts	26	1		1		1	2	5	3	7		5		2	
Rhode Island	4							2				1			1
Connecticut	9							2	2	2		1	1	1	
Middle Atlantic	156	11	6	5		10	1	26	27	23	13	29	6	6	4
New York	95	9	4	5		7		16	22	13	4	15	3	5	1
New Jersey	17					1		4	2	2	2	5			1
Pennsylvania	44	2	2			2	1	6	3	8	7	9	3	1	2
East North Central	258	14	8	3	3	31	16	40	42	36	21	37	7	11	3
Ohio	55	4	4			4	3	9	13	5	5	5	2	4	1
Indiana	26	2		1	1	7	1		6	2	3	4		1	
Illinois	113	5	3	1	1	13	10	23	12	17	6	20	3	3	1
Michigan	49	3	1	1	1	3	1	8	11	10	5	6	1	1	
Wisconsin	15					4	1			2	2	2	1	2	1
West North Central	369	28	8	1	19	17	11	55	42	57	77	46	16	12	8
Minnesota	24	1			1	1	3	4		6	2	5	2		
Iowa	32	1	1			5		6	2	5	4	2	2	2	3
Missouri	148	12	4	1	7	2	5	23	16	25	35	18	4	6	2
North Dakota	21	4	1		3			1	3	2	6	3	2		
South Dakota	17	1			1	1		3	3	1	4	1	2	1	
Nebraska	63	5	1		4	1	3	7	8	7	18	9	1	2	2
Kansas	64	4	1		3	7		11	10	11	8	8	3	1	1

South Atlantic	60	2	1	-------	1	5	6	9	6	5	9	10	4	4	-------
Delaware	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Maryland	9	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	2	1	1	4	-------	1	-------	-------	-------
Virginia	4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	2	-------	-------	2	-------	-------	-------	-------
District of Columbia	4	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	3	-------	-------	-------
West Virginia	6	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	1	-------	2	1	-------	1	-------
North Carolina	8	1	1	-------	-------	2	-------	1	1	-------	1	1	-------	1	-------
South Carolina	6	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	2	1	1	-------	1	1	-------	-------	-------
Georgia	11	1	-------	-------	1	-------	1	3	-------	-------	1	1	2	2	-------
Florida	10	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	2	1	2	2	2	-------	-------
East South Central	56	6	4	-------	2	4	4	8	5	4	12	7	3	3	-------
Kentucky	14	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	-------
Tennessee	22	3	2	-------	1	2	2	3	3	2	4	1	1	1	-------
Alabama	15	2	1	-------	1	-------	1	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	-------
Mississippi	5	1	1	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	3	-------	-------	-------	-------
West South Central	586	59	10	3	46	13	14	62	60	65	197	68	14	26	8
Arkansas	106	10	1	-------	9	1	1	6	6	13	47	10	6	3	3
Louisiana	24	2	2	-------	-------	-------	1	2	1	5	4	6	-------	3	-------
Oklahoma	308	36	6	2	28	7	5	34	27	33	120	29	3	13	1
Texas	148	11	1	1	9	5	7	20	26	14	26	23	5	7	4
Mountain	290	16	4	5	7	8	6	39	32	45	66	44	11	16	7
Montana	23	1	-------	1	-------	1	3	6	3	-------	4	3	2	-------	-------
Idaho	39	2	-------	-------	2	-------	-------	5	3	5	17	-------	2	3	2
Wyoming	7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	2	2	1	-------	1	-------	-------
Colorado	80	6	2	1	3	1	1	9	10	15	13	20	1	4	-------
New Mexico	25	1	1	-------	-------	1	-------	2	4	4	5	4	2	2	-------
Arizona	66	2	-------	1	1	2	1	4	5	11	21	11	2	5	2
Utah	42	4	1	2	1	3	1	11	3	7	4	4	1	2	2
Nevada	8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	2	1	1	2	-------	-------	1
Pacific	131	6	4	1	1	8	1	17	24	20	25	18	2	8	2
Washington	81	2	1	1	-------	6	-------	11	18	13	14	11	2	4	-------
Oregon	50	4	3	-------	1	2	1	6	6	7	11	7	-------	4	2
Mexico	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	1	-------
Other foreign countries	8	3	3	-------	-------	-------	1	1	-------	1	1	-------	-------	1	-------
United States Territories	3	1	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------

The table on pages 2886–7 shows by State of origin the industry in which the applicants had previously been employed. Of the 1,961 persons 525, or 27 percent, had an agricultural background, and 292, or 15 percent, had formerly been in domestic and personal service. The manufacturing, construction, and trade industry groups each contributed approximately 10 percent to this group of migrants entering California and seeking aid.

It may be noted that, although agriculture as a whole contributed only 27 percent to the total number of applicants, in the four West South Central States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, it contributed 43 percent; and 50 percent of the persons who had come from Oklahoma had agricultural backgrounds.

The table on pages 2888–9 shows the occupational classifications of the 1,961 transients included in the survey. The previous table indicated that 525 persons had an agricultural background. Of these, 421 were reported as unskilled farm workers. In addition to these, 267 workers were reported as unskilled nonfarm workers. Therefore, a total of 688 persons or 35 percent of the number included in the survey were reported as unskilled workers. The skilled trades, the semiskilled trades, and the domestic and personal services each contributed in the neighborhood of 13 percent. There were 149 or 7.5 percent of the applicants reported as professional and kindred workers.

The reasons for starting migration, as stated by the 1,961 transient cases applying for relief, are shown in table 9 according to their occupational classifications. Approximately one-half left their homes seeking work in general with no specific place of settlement in mind. The fact that 50 percent of the applicants took 4 months or more before reaching California is a reflection of this fact.

TABLE 9.—*Reasons for starting migration as stated by 1,961 Federal transient cases applying for relief at offices of the State relief administration of California during the last quarter of 1936, analyzed by occupational classification*

Stated reason for starting migration	Total	Occupational classification						
		Professional, clerical, managers and owners	Manual nonfarm workers	Domestics and personal service	Farm operators, owners, and workers	Inexperienced	Not specified	Unemployable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Drought	94	1	20	5	65	2	1	--------
Seeking work in general	865	91	353	105	264	28	20	4
Seeking work in definite place	243	27	122	38	43	10	3	--------
Promised job	58	12	33	7	5	1	--------	--------
Migratory work	35	1	12	--------	22	--------	--------	--------
Adventure	65	3	26	12	11	12	1	--------
Habitual transient	23	1	12	3	4	--------	--------	3
Domestic trouble	61	10	13	24	2	9	2	1
Inadequate relief	15	--------	7	2	6	--------	--------	--------
Location unhealthy	222	37	92	32	40	8	7	6
Visit or vacation	113	13	29	25	14	12	8	12
Business	17	7	6	1	2	--------	1	--------
Institutional release	1	1	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Other	98	17	30	16	17	8	4	6
Not specified	51	3	20	2	7	1	17	1
Total	1,961	224	775	272	502	91	64	33

About one out of eight reported that they had left home seeking work in a definite place and about the same proportion indicated that they had started their migration because of health problems.

The figures show that approximately 5 percent indicated that they had left home because of the drought. However, this figure should be considered in relation to the two reasons immediately following, "seeking work in general" and "seeking work in a definite place," since the drought may have been the casual factor in many of the cases of these persons leaving their homes to seek work.

It will be noted that in the group of farm operators, owners, and workers, 13 percent reported that they had left home as a result of the drought, but an additional 68 percent indicated that they had left seeking work, or because the location was unhealthy. To what extent the drought entered into these latter cases is unknown.

In interpreting the above statements it should be noted that the four reasons above mentioned contributed in about the same degree in the case of nonagricultural persons as it did in the case of the farm workers.

Table 10 shows the number of times the transients applying for relief had entered California. In 1,388 of the 1,961 instances, this was the first time that these persons had come to California. This represented 70 percent of the cases. An additional 20 percent had been in California once before. The few persons who reported that they had entered California numerous times previously were, in all probability, following the crops as agricultural laborers.

TABLE 10.—*Number of times transients applying for relief have entered California*

Number of times:	*Number of cases*
1	1,388
2	398
3	105
4	43
5	10
6	3
7	2
8	3
9	2
10	-----
11	1
12	1
13	1
14	-----
15	-----
16	-----
17	-----
18	-----
19	-----
20	-----
21	-----
22	1
Not specified [1]	3
Total	1,961

---

[1] For facility in presentation, the percentage data have not made allowance for the data shown in the tables as "Not specified." This statistical correction would have no significant bearing on the figures presented.

Table 11 indicates that in 1,604 of the 1,961 cases the head of the family was a man and in 357 cases the head of the family was a woman. Of the 1,604 male heads, 1,217, or approximately 75 percent, were persons who were classed as physically capable of doing a full day's work and sufficiently skilled in their occupations to be normally satisfactory to private employers. Of the 357 women heads, 201, or about 55 percent, were classed in this category of group 1 employables.

TABLE 11.—*Employability of 1,961 Federal transient cases applying for relief at the offices of the State relief administration during the last quarter of 1936*

	Total	Male heads	Female heads
Group I	1,418	1,217	201
Group II	171	125	46
Group III	251	163	88
Not specified	121	99	22
Total	1,961	1,604	357

Employability of alternate members in cases whose heads were classified as group III

Employability:	*Number of cases*
Group I	35
Group II	11
Not specified	205
Total	251

Definitions of groups I, II, and III:

Group I—Those persons who are physically capable of doing a full day's work and sufficiently skilled in their occupations to normally be satisfactory to private employers.

Group II—Those persons who are able to do good work but who, because of age or other reasons, are unable to compete normally in private industry with younger and more efficient workers in similar occupations.

Group III—Those who because of physical disabilities, age, or other reasons are unable to perform work in a satisfactory manner.

Table 12 shows, according to sex of the head of the family, the size of the household of the cases included in the survey. It is significant to note that of all cases included in the survey, 22 percent were single men and 8 percent were single women.

TABLE 12.—*Size of household of 1,961 Federal transient cases applying for relief at office of the State relief administration during the third quarter of 1936*

Number in family	Total	Male heads	Female heads
1	583	427	156
2	364	286	78
3	291	244	47
4	212	187	25
5	171	151	20
6	88	83	5
7	61	59	2
8	25	25	
9	16	15	1
10	6	6	
11	3	3	
12			
13			
14			
15	1	1	
Not specified	140	117	23
Total	1,961	1,604	357

WHAT HAPPENS TO REJECTED APPLICANTS

It is necessary to be aware of the consequences of the rejection of applicants for relief for reasons other than financial ineligibility. Rejected applicants continue to be a part of the economic structure of a county or State in which they are present and therefore affect the social and economic conditions in the State.

Persons who are in need but who are denied public aid for technical reasons continue to subsist through the sale of personal belongings, through borrowing, through reducing the quantity and quality of their food, through doing without necessary clothing and shelter, and through acceptance of jobs at substandard wages which tend to reduce the general wage scale and the general standard of living.

The State relief administration is aware of many individual situations where persons continue to subsist through the above methods after having been rejected by a relief agency. A sample survey was made to determine what happened to persons rejected for technical reasons after the passage of restricted unemployment relief legislation in February 1940. In addition to changing residence requirements, the legislation denied relief to certain aliens, limited the maximum amount of aid which could be extended to a particular family, and required deductions of all outside income of all family members, in determining relief grants.

As a result of this legislation, cases which heretofore had been eligible for aid became ineligible and other applications which previously would have been accepted were rejected. The State Relief Administration surveyed 148 cases in

San Diego County who were denied relief as a result of the new legislation, and 77 cases whose relief grants were reduced thereby. The 148 cases consisted of 71 cases whose applications for aid were rejected, and 77 cases which had been receiving aid but which were closed as a result of the new legislation.

Of the applicants rejected, 25 of the 71 cases had found it necessary to move, and it was impossible to secure additional information concerning them. Of the remaining 46 cases, the major adjustment forced upon the family concerned their food. Twenty families, or 43 percent, found it necessary to eliminate fresh milk from their diets, or substitute canned milk therefor, reduce, and sometimes eliminate, meat from the diets, increase the consumption of starches, etc. It should be noted that a majority of the members of these 20 families were children. Medical surveys in this area have indicated that diet changes caused by lack of sufficient funds have often resulted in the occurrence of rickets, pellagra, scurvy, secondary anemia and other diseases of malnutrition which tend to make the patient susceptible to more serious diseases such as tuberculosis.

Rent was in arrears in 35 percent of the families interviewed. In 28 percent of the cases utilities were delinquent. In 41 percent of the cases there was a need for clothing. In one out of every four cases medical care was needed. It was obvious that the refusal of relief intensified the problems of many of the cases which had applied for aid. In a few instances the applicants have continued to get along through inadequate part-time jobs at meager wages.

The cases to whom relief was discontinued as a result of the new legislation show a very similar pattern. In 6 of the 77 cases the family found it necessary to move since they were unable to meet their rent. Detailed interviews were taken in the remaining 71 cases. Twenty-eight or thirty-six percent were behind in their rent. In 3 instances utilities had been discontinued and in 16 cases the payment of utilities was already delinquent. Two-thirds of the former relief recipients needed additional clothing. The situation in relation to diet was more serious, with numerous reductions in the quantity and quality of food. Eleven of the families indicated that they were unable to manage 3 meals daily. In 9 cases special diets had previously been prescribed because of illness but the family had been unable to purchase the needed food.

A few examples will illustrate what has occurred to several of the cases surveyed. Family A consisted of a man, his wife and three minor children. Their application for aid was rejected because of lack of 3-year residence in California. At time of application the family had exhausted all means of support, having borrowed $100 on a car 2 months prior to application. Since termination of employment a month prior to application, the family lived entirely on credit, accumulating a $26 grocery bill. The rent was 1½ months in arrears and gas and light bills were delinquent. It was not possible to purchase milk and vegetables for the minor children and their diet consisted chiefly of beans and potatoes. Credit for groceries was being discontinued. At the time of the survey the family was being pressed for their back rent and had absolutely no idea as to how they would manage in the future.

Case B consisted of a man, his wife and three minor children. Their application for aid was rejected by the State relief administration because of lack of residence. After rejection, the man secured some odd jobs as a laborer, but his total earnings during approximately a month and a half were about $52. It became necessary for the eldest child, a 17-year-old daughter, to leave home because of the crowded condition and the lack of finances, and to move in with friends in El Centro. The mother of the family at the time of the interview was pregnant and expecting confinement shortly. Prenatal care had not been received. No medical arrangements had been made. The family was unable to buy the proper foods and was using canned milk entirely. All members of the family were in need of clothing. The head of the family had no prospects of employment.

Example C. The case was that of a man 52 years old, temporarily separated from his wife and child because of their financial situation and because of their ineligibility for relief on the basis of residence requirements. The family had come to California from Texas 9 months previously and had refused to return and was therefore rejected by the State relief administration. When the man lost his job, his wife and child went to live with her father. having been forced to move. The wife's father's resources were limited because of the irregularity of agricultural work and his family of six. The only work "C" had had during 2½ months was four days of labor during which he earned $12. With this he paid part of his rent, sent $6 to his family and reduced his grocery bill from $8.70 to $5.48. At the time of the interview "C" was sharing a one-room lean-to with another man and was eating one meal a day, consisting largely of potatoes, beans, and canned milk, which had been his diet for several months.

TESTIMONY OF S. G. RUBINOW—Resumed

Mr. Rubinow. This is our report so far as it affects the migratory workers particularly, with factual data and tables; but there are no interpretations in it. It was for that reason that I begged the indulgence of the committee to present the general statement that I read previously.

Now, I have a very important engagement, but before I leave, Congressman Tolan, I would like to introduce Mrs. Marie Deal, chief of our bureau of certification, Mr. E. M. Cooper, chief of our bureau of statistics, and Mr. James B. Reese, chief of our bureau of surplus commodities.

The Chairman. We will note in the record their presence here, and I may say to you folks that it is after the adjournment hour and now I am sure that the chief here has presented the data that we want, but I will also like to say to you that our record will not close until the last week in November and if anything additional occurs to you on account of conditions between now and then, or anything else, why, our records will be open for you.

Mr. Cooper. Then we would like to present these for the record now.

The Chairman. We will mark them as exhibits.

(The documents referred to were received and marked as exhibits.)

(The exhibits mentioned consist of (*a*) a bound volume entitled "Review of Activities of the State Relief Administration of California," (*b*) List of References on Migrants, (*c*) a bound volume entitled "Transients in California" and (*d*) a book entitled "Migratory Labor in California," which are in committee files (not reprinted) and the "Preliminary Report Transient Program" is given below.)

PRELIMINARY REPORT TRANSIENT PROGRAM OF THE STATE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, FEBRUARY 1939, BY JAMES B. REESE

I. Introduction

No attempt was made in the preparation of this report to secure original or new statistical information, nor were schedules prepared for the analysis of present case loads. The reasons for these omissions were threefold: First, prior and subsequent to the termination of the Federal transient program a multiplicity of such studies were made; second, the results of any study of applications and rejections of transients for relief to the State relief administration would undoubtedly give a distorted picture inasmuch as intake policy determines not only the type of cases accepted for care, but also the volume of such applications; and, third, such a survey would be impossible of accomplishment without a reasonable allotment of staff to such a project. However, use was made of such studies[1] as were immediately available in the office.

The basis of this report is a study of policy, techniques, and facilities for the care of transients as determined by conferences with State relief administration staff members, Council of Social Agencies, public and private agencies, and interested citizens.[2]

---

[1] Transients in California, Division of Research and Survey, State Relief Administration, August 3, 1936. Résumé of Social Work and Camps for Transient Boys in Southern California, Helen Montegriffo, August 30, 1935. Statistical Information, Los Angeles, 1938, Bernice Copland. Miscellaneous Transient Files of State Relief Administration.

For expediency's sake this report will deal with the usual categories of the transient problem separately and in the following order: Boys, single women, families, single men, and medical care.

II. Résumé: History of Transient Care in Los Angeles County

Prior to the depression and while we were still riding the crest of prosperity, California, and more particularly Los Angeles County, was the mecca of all westward movement. Climate, newly developed agricultural fields, motion-picture industries, adventure, and restlessness brought people to California during the more prosperous times. Not an insignificant number of these people found adjustment to their new environment difficult and many were cared for by the Travelers Aid Society and other private agencies. In 1924 the Catholic Welfare Bureau, noting that large numbers of boys were becoming stranded in Los Angeles, opened the Junipero Serra Boys Club. This was followed by the opening of the Community Boys Lodge in 1927, and still later a home for colored boys.

The depression brought increasing numbers of transients to California, and just before the collapse of the public and private agencies in Los Angeles under this ever-increasing problem, the Federal Transient Service was instituted in 1933. This agency coordinated the activities of the private agencies and supplemented them by an extensive program of its own. A family welfare bureau, a single men's department, and a boys' division were developed. The Federal Transient Service continued to serve nonresidents until it was abruptly terminated by an administrative order from Washington in September 1935. An attempt was made to salvage the family bureau and boys' division by integration with the State Relief Administration, but no attempt was made to carry on the single men program beyond the time necessary to dispose of certain of the unemployables in the camps.

Since September 1935 there has been a gradual restriction of care to transients until we find, in February 1939, a program simply of emergency care pending verification of residence, authorization for return, and transportation.

III. Transient Boys

A. PROBLEM

The lack of a centralized clearing house for transient boys, the State relief administration policy of rejecting applications at point of intake for refusal to return to legal residence, which tends to discourage applications, and the minimum private agency care available in los Angeles, makes it quite hazardous to even estimate the extent and scope of the transient boys' problem. However, such statistics as are available are enlightening. For example, during 1938, 2,022 boys applied to the State relief administration for assistance. Of this number 1,019, or more than 50 percent, were rejected by the intake division and the balance accepted for emergency care and transportation to legal residence.

An analysis of the reasons for the rejections developed the following:

	Percent
Refusal to return to legal residence	50
Service only (referred to Travelers Aid Society)	20
Adequate resources	20
Under 18 years (referred to Bureau of Indigent Relief)	10

It will be noted from the above that over 500 hungry boys were turned out into the streets to shift for themselves, without even the most temporary of care during 1938, because they refused to say they would return to their legal residence when authorization and verification was secured.

The Annual Report of the Los Angeles City Police Department for the fiscal year 1937–38 shows 3,991 boys and 18 girls between the ages of 18 and 21 years were arrested on vagrancy charges. The number of arrests for vagrancy of youths under 18 years is not immediately available. (These figures are being compiled for the State relief administration by the crime prevention detail.) However, the bureau of indigent relief reports that 113 of the cases of boys closed during the period July 1, 1938, to January 31, 1939, were referred to it by the police department. This would seem to indicate that between two and three hundred transient boys under 18 years of age are coming to the attention of the police department. (Actual number reported by juvenile police, 314.)

---

[2] Bernice Copland, Elizabeth Connolly, Fuqua, Whittier, Mary Stanton, Walter Chambers, Dorothy Wysor Smith, Msgr. T. J. O'Dwyer, Joseph Thesing, Karl Holton, Lieutenant Graeb, Lieutenant Lester, A. C. Price, Gertrude Logan, Charles I. Schottland, Fred Coggan, Henry Richmond, etc.

Social workers from both public and private agencies interested in the juvenile problem advise me that the criminal court dockets are crowded with out-of-State boys between 18 and 22 years and that a substantial number of the twelve-hundred-odd persons who may be found sleeping any night in the six 5-cent all-night motion-picture houses on Main Street are transient boys.

In the face of this problem the State relief administration continues its policy of treating this juvenile problem as though it were one of unemployment relief.

The following analysis of 390 open and closed cases made by the transient intake supervisor of the State relief administration, seems to substantiate the statement that the transient boys' problem should be viewed as a juvenile problem and not simply as one of unemployment relief.

Age groupings:	
14 years	3
15 years	2
16 years	6
17 years	13
18 years	80
19 years	106
20 years	91
21 years	79
Over 21 years	4
Age unknown	9
Time on road on date of application:	
Less than 1 week	37
1 week to 1 month	127
1 to 3 months	97
3 to 6 months	35
6 months to 1 year	9
1 to 3 years	30
Over 3 years	14
Unknown	41
Physical condition: Good, 353; disability, 32; not determined, 5.	
Guardians:	
Mother and father	159
Mother only	73
Father only	34
Father and stepmother	23
Mother and stepfather	26
Brother	7
Sister	8
Aunt	6
Guardians—Continued.	
Uncle	3
Grandparent	8
Foster mother	1
State	9
Stepmother	1
Married	9
Social agency	2
Not determined	21
Financial status of guardians:	
Independent	233
Relief	42
Work Projects Administration	31
Not known	84
Educational status:	
Second grade	3
Third grade	1
Fourth grade	4
Fifth grade	6
Seventh grade	22
Eighth grade	76
Ninth grade	52
Tenth grade	71
Eleventh grade	40
Twelfth grade	59
First year college	2
Second year college	2
Third year college	2
Fourth year college	1
Unknown	49

The above statistical data (note financial status of guardians), plus the fact that the Junipero Serra Boys Club and the Community Boys Lodge had under care approximately 100 boys at all times prior to 1929, indicate that the plan of treatment for transient boys should be somewhat different than that accorded most unemployment relief problems.

B. PRESENT FACILITIES

The current State relief administration program for transient boys in Los Angeles is intended to meet the relief and transportation needs of transient unattached minors 18 to 21 years of age, inclusive, whose parents or guardians are not residents of California. A discussion of the problem with the State relief administration workers charged with the responsibility of carrying out this program developed that major emphasis is placed upon emergency aid and transportation to legal residence, and that there is little or no recognition of the social problems involved. No attempt is made to determine by agency contacts the underlying factors which caused boys to leave home, no counseling service is provided to condition the boys' attitude toward returning to his legal residence, and no effort is made to secure the services of a social agency in the community from which the boys came to correct the conditions causing them to leave either prior or subsequent to their return. In fact, these workers advise me that frequently the only contacts they have with the boys are at the time of application and train time. Workers never visit boys while in camp or the Junipero Serra Boys Club and only call them into the office for interviews when additional information is required to verify residence.

Pending verification of legal residence and the securing of authorization to return, the boys cared for by the State relief administration are placed in either the Junipero Serra Boys Club or one of three State relief administration camps for single men. Pacoima is used as an intake camp, DeVore for venereals, and Pales Verde for men and boys of normal health.

The Junipero Serra Boys Club, in addition to providing food, shelter, clothing, and a limited amount of medical and dental care, maintains a well-rounded leisure-time program. The Los Angeles school system provides a teacher who has classes from 9 a. m. to 3 p. m. 5 days each week. These classes are compulsory for boys under 18 years of age and optional for those over 18. The educational program includes classes in journalism, handcrafts, shopwork, history, English, citizenship, and mathematics. There are also night courses conducted by the Work Projects Administration (E. E. P.) for boys over 18 who do not attend the day classes. A recreational leader is in attendance 4 days each week. Athletic events are held at a nearby playground while table games and boxing are conducted in the clubrooms.

According to the annual report of the club, the per diem cost of the service rendered these boys is 89 cents. The State relief administration pays 60 cents per day per boy for those placed in the institution. The service rendered by the Junipero Serra Boys Club could be improved by the addition of a case worker and the development of a more constructive work program.

The State relief administration camp program for transient boys consists simply of housing boys in one of the single-men camps (Palos Verde) pending their return to legal residence. A gesture is made toward segregating the boys from the older men, but it consists of merely assigning to them the required number of tents at one end of the company street. The camp director explained the need for segregation on the basis that the boys were too noisy at night for the older men, so it was deemed advisable to remove them to the far end of the campgrounds.

Camp Palos Verde is located in the beautiful Palos Verde Hills overlooking the ocean. Bathing, fishing, athletics, and shows are the chief recreational outlet for the camp members. The housing units are tents rather than barracks, and sleep six to eight persons in double decker beds.

The men and boys are employed 6 hours a day on a county road project. The camp site is owned by the Palos Verde Land Co.

There is no counselor or case worker in the camp to serve the needs of the boys. The director introduced me to a middle-aged man whom he described as a recreational leader and attendance officer. The boys at the time of my visit, 3:30 p. m., were loafing around the camp and there was no evidence of any organized program for them.

The bureau of indigent relief accepts responsibility for transient boys under 18 years of age. Its program is similar to that of the State relief administration. Emergency relief is provided at the Junipero Serra Boys Club pending verification and return to legal residence.

During the period July 1, 1938, to January 31, 1939, the bureau of indigent relief cared for 345 transient boys. These boys were cared for pending their return to legal residence in the following manner:

Junipero Serra Boys Club	278
Boarding homes	40
Juvenile Hall	8
County jail	3
Others	16

The age groupings of boys cared for by the bureau of indigent relief, as determined by a survey of 251 cases, were as follows:

Age:	
10	1
11	2
13	5
14	16
15	38
16	75
17	114

Gertrude Logan, director of the children's aid section of the bureau of indigent relief, stated that the experience of that organization has demonstrated the inadvisability of a strict enforcement of a policy of emergency care and return to legal residence. Recently the bureau of indigent relief changed its policy of routinely returning boys over 16 years of age to their legal residence to one of return on a selective basis only. The plan for those whom the bureau of indigent relief will decide not to return is not well defined. Mrs. Logan advises that this problem has not come up since this change in policy was made effective. She believes that the State relief administration program for transient boys should take into consideration boys between 16 and 18 years as well as those over 18 years, inasmuch as the bureau of indigent relief is not equipped to afford an adequate plan for their care.

The juvenile probation department, through the juvenile court cares for delinquent transient boys. This program is mainly one of camp care and return to legal residence.

The downtown missions for men provide housing for some boys. The exact number is not obtainable. The director of the Union Rescue Mission states: "No one is turned away as long as there is an empty bed." He further stated that if he noticed a boy in the mission who appeared under 18 years of age, he referred him to the bureau of indigent relief. He also expressed the opinion that some provision should be made for those 18 to 22 years of age. The director of the Midnight Mission makes use of the State relief administration and the bureau for indigent relief for the care of boys and only occasionally during late hours gives them housing.

The Travelers Aid Society is prepared to render case-work service to transient boys, but due to its limited relief funds is able to provide very little care.

C. BOYS UNDER CARE

The State relief administration had under care on February 9, 1939, the following boys:

Camp Palos Verde	48
Camp DeVore	3
Junipero Serra Boys Club	12
Home of relatives	5
Total	68

The juvenile: The juvenile probation department advises that it has under care 15 delinquent transient boys.

The bureau of indigent relief has 22 boys under 18 years of age, who are in the Junipero Serra Boys Club awaiting transportation to their legal residences.

During 1938, 1,003 transient boys were accepted for care by the State relief administration, 750 were placed in camps, 202 in the Junipero Serra Boys Club, 47 lived with relatives, and 4 received cash relief.

An analysis of the reasons for closing cases during the period March 1937 to March 1938 developed the following:

Returned to legal residence	671
Deserted	457
Over age	57
Secured private employment	16
Placed in legal custody	15
Referred to various agencies	149
Total	1,365

D. PROPOSED PLAN FOR CARE OF TRANSIENT BOYS

1. Immediate policy changes:

(*a*) The emphasis at present placed upon return to legal residence by the intake division should be replaced by one of attention to the immediate needs for shelter, food, clothing, and medical care.

(*b*) The policy of rejecting boys at intake for refusing to return to their legal residence should be discontinued.

(*c*) The policy of discontinuing aid to boys receiving care immediately upon their refusal to return to their legal residence should be modified to a policy that permits the social worker time to work out socially desirable plans for their welfare.

(*d*) The age limits should be 16 to 22 years rather than 18 to 22 years.

2. Facilities needed:

(*a*) Transient boys registration bureau.

(*b*) Intake camp and treatment center.

(*c*) Vocational training camp.

(*d*) Additional private agency facilities similar to Junipero Serra Boys Club.

3. Program:

(*a*) Transient boys registration bureau. The function of this department would be to:

- (*x*) Provide a central intake for transient boys.[3]
- (*y*) Assume responsibility for social work statistics pertiment to the transient boys' problem.
- (*z*) To provide a clearing house for those interested in arousing the community conscience to its transient boys' problem.

(*b*) Intake camp: It is intended that this camp provide emergency care pending the development of a suitable plan by the social service staff for boys' welfare. Facilities for physical and psychiatric examinations and the treatment of minor ailments should be available. If it is deemed impractical to provide medical facilities in the camp, then the panel plan for medical care should be used and a medical social worker assigned to this camp. This alternative program should be supplemented by a first aid program.

(*c*) Vocational training camp: The facilities of this camp should provide a constructive vocational training and work program. The work program should be of such a productive nature that it would lend dignity to work and should be geared into an educational program in such a way that when a youngster leaves the camp he will take with him a sense of accomplishment and confidence in his ability to become a productive unit of society.

Boys in this camp would not be asked to work for only their room and board. Productive work is always worthy of an adequate wage. It is only "made work programs" that call for work with a remuneration of maintenance only.

Certain safeguards, perhaps similar to a parent-son relationship, should undoubtedly be established to assist the boys in reaching a socially desirable objective. For example: It would probably be wise to exercise a reasonable control over the earnings of these boys. The major portion should be deposited to the boy's credit for transportation to legal residence, subsistence en route, education, and to assist certain boys to become absorbed in this community.

The maintenance work of this camp should be of such a nature that boys will learn as they work. For example, even such menial tasks as dish washing, janitor, and kitchen duty should be a part of a planned vocational training program. These tasks, under proper supervision and direction, have a definite training value for restaurant, hotel, and kitchen work.

Training in cleanliness with proper implements and cleaning materials would turn out efficient janitors and helpers. Painting in its true sense, not merely the technique of "brush slinging" but color schemes, combinations, designs, mixing, and paint removal, would be useful for future avocations.

For those interested in landscaping, gardening, and botany, the campgrounds would lend unlimited possibilities.

The above programs would not only add zest to necessary maintenance work but would also tend to raise the standard of camp life from the drabness into which it has fallen, to an exciting experience of learning.

The foregoing work program, although essential to the maintenance of any camp, would occupy the time of but a few of the boys. The major program should be sufficiently varied to occupy the interest of all who come under care and is limited only by our imagination. The following are merely suggestive.

Auto mechanics: A machine shop where State equipment may be repaired by boys under the supervision of a trained mechanic.

Animal husbandry: Dairy and poultry products could be raised, not only for the camp, but also for general distribution.

Forestry Work: Fire prevention.

Farm products.

Tailoring.

---

[3] It is proposed at this time that only a brief eligibility interview (similar to a qualifying interview) be taken at the time of application by the transient boys registration bureau and that the complete first interview and social planning be left to the intake camp case workers.

Shoe repairing, and a multiplicity of other projects which would in themselve be not only productive, but also vocational training in nature.

If the camp could be located within the Los Angeles school district undoubtedly the school system could be prevailed upon to supply classes which would be particularly adapted to the transient boy. These classes could be supplemented by EEP (WPA) workers.

It is axiomatic that all boys' programs must have an adequate recreational program under trained supervision. For this reason a recreational program should be developed which would call for the participation of the largest number of boys and reduce to the spectator stage the smallest possible number.

Discreet and intelligent counseling by trained personnel aimed toward assisting these boys to constructively plan for their future welfare should be an important adjunct to the camp program. Case workers should be charged with this duty as a part of their responsibility toward the boys under care.

Since camp at best is an artificial situation, caution should be exercised lest the camp become an "end in itself." It might be advisable to place a flexible time limit on the period a boy could remain.

Aside from a certain basic well-trained staff the camp should be operated by the boys themselves.

(*d*) Private lodges:

At the present time the only private agency attempting to meet the housing needs of transient boys is the Junipero Serra Boys Club. This agency has a maximum capacity of 65 boys. This lodge is sponsored by the Catholic Welfare Bureau and was established originally in 1924 to meet the needs of Catholic transient boys stranded in Los Angeles. However, since the liquidation of the Federal transient boys camps and the community boys' lodge (a community chest agency established primarily to meet the needs of non-Catholic boys) the Junipero Serra Boys Club has attempted to serve all boys referred to it by any of the public agencies.

There is an undoubted need for the reestablishment of a second housing unit for transient boys similar to the old community boys' lodge, inasmuch as a liberalized transient boys policy would bring under care the boys now reputedly sleeping in flop houses, all-night theaters, and jungles. This boys' lodge should have accommodations for approximately 50 boys.

The objective of these lodges should be to provide the medium by which boys whom it is determined should not, for good social reasons, be returned to their legal residences, may be absorbed into the community.

The program of these lodges should be aimed toward carrying to fulfillment the plan determined upon by the social workers attached to the transient boys division of the State relief administration.

The relationship of the State relief administration to these agencies should be one that would supplement their programs but not supplant them. However, the State relief administration, by virtue of its part in paying for the maintenance of the boys under care, should have a voice, at least advisory, in the formulation of the agency's program.

The State relief administration should pay an equitable amount, at least equivalent to the cost of camp care, to these agencies. The present procedure of allowing the minimum State relief administration single-man's budget is unfair, both to the agency and to the boys, since the difference between actual cost and that allowed must be taken from an essential part of the program which the State relief administration must look to the private agencies to provide.

Three social agencies in Los Angeles have indicated a desire to enter into this field of providing lodging for transient boys, i. e., Travelers Aid Society, the Midnight Mission, and the Volunteers of America. All are handicapped by a lack of money, but each indicated that there was a possibility of its securing the necessary funds, providing the State relief administration would meet a portion of the maintenance cost by paying to the agency an amount approximating the single-man's budget for each boy under care.

4. Staff requirements for transient boys work (for complete organizational chart see latter part of report):

Executive:
- Supervisor of transient boys division, 1.
- Secretary to supervisor of transient boys division, 1.

Social service:
- Case supervisors—1 to each 5 case workers and qualifiers.
- Qualifiers for transient boys' registration bureau—1 to each 8 to 10 applications per day.

Caseworker—1 to each 25 boys in the intake camp and 1 to each 50 boys in the vocational training camp.

Clerical: Should be allotted to the social-service division on the basis of 2 clerical persons to every 3 professional persons employed.

Camps:
- Camp director—1 to each camp.
- Assistant director and camp manager—1 to each camp.
- Recreational leader—1 to each camp.
- Supervisor of vocational training and work projects—1 to each camp.
- First cook—1 to each camp.
- Second cook—1 to each camp.
- Boys' counsellors—a minimum of 3 to each camp in order to have 1 for supervisorial duty on hand at all times.
- Medical care—1 half-time physician for each camp.

5. Community programming:

The proposed program, to be successful, must have the support of the community. To secure this support it is suggested that a committee representing labor, social agencies, the juvenile police and probation departments, and the citizens at large, be appointed by the Governor, State relief commission, or some authorized representative of the Governor, to act in an advisory capacity to the transient boys division. This committee should be a subcommittee of the general transient committee. (See committee and administrative organization in latter part of this report.)

IV. Families

A. POLICY

Prior to February 9, 1939, the policy of the State Relief Administration in Los Angeles County was to make "consent to return to legal residence" at the time of application a condition precedent to relief. On this date the policy was changed by an administrative order and transient families were made eligible for emergency aid pending verification of residence and receipt of authorization for return, whether or not they signify a willingness to return to their legal residence at the time of application for relief. Under this policy, as soon as legal residence can be verified and authorization secured for family's return, transportation is offered and if refused aid is discontinued.

The present policy is not as harsh as that which prevailed prior to February 9, 1939, but it still lacks much that is to be desired. During 1938, while the "return or else" policy was in effect, 12,910 applications were received from transients, of which only 5,292 or about 39 percent were accepted for temporary aid and transportation to legal residence. Although there is no available statistical information on the reasons for rejecting 61 percent of the applications, it is fair to assume that the majority were rejected for refusing, at the point of intake to consent to return to legal residences.

The policy now in force permits a slight breathing spell between that critical time when the family is faced with the need of applying for relief and the necessity for making a decision as to whether or not it will return to its legal residence. The period, in most instances, is still too brief for a careful and well thought out decision on the part of the family. It is still a "return or else" policy with little or no consideration given to a determination of what is socially desirable for the particular family.

B. SOME STATISTICAL INFORMATION

1. A review by the urban district office of 290 transient applications accepted for temporary care during the 4-week period just prior to February 1, 1939, developed the following interesting facts:

Origin of these families	*Percent*
Dust Bowl area	52
Great Lakes area	17
Rocky Mountain area	13
Northeastern area	11
Southern seaboard	6
Pacific coast area	2
New applications	73
Applied for assistance within 1 month after their arrival in California	21
Applied for assistance within 3 months after their arrival	54
Applied for assistance during the first week of their arrival	10
Applied for assistance within 2 days after their arrival	7

During this same period 36 percent of all transient applications for relief were rejected for refusing to consent to return to legal residences.

2. The following is an analysis of the reasons for closing transient cases during 1938:

Secured employment in private industry	581
Assigned to Work Projects Administration or other Federal projects	90
Sufficient income or resources	22
Became unemployable	15
Under care of other agency	30
Sent to camp	98
Returned to legal residence in other States	2, 823
Refused to return to legal residence	181
Left of own accord or unable to locate	847
Responsibility assumed by relatives or friends	52
Unwilling to furnish information necessary to establish eligibility	21
All other reasons	538

The State Relief Administration statistical reports do not show reasons for closings broken down by classifications such as families, boys, and single women.

During the week ending February 23, 1939, 177 applications were received from transient families. Ninety-three or 53 percent were rejected, while 84 or 47 percent were accepted for temporary relief and transportation to legal residence. On the last day of the week 745 transient families were receiving relief.

C. FACILITIES FOR THE CARE OF TRANSIENT FAMILIES

The urban district office, located at 660 East Twenty-second Street, receives applications from transient families residing within the city limits of Los Angeles. The Long Beach, Pasadena, Alhambra, and San Fernando district offices accept applications from transient families living in the communities they serve.

The qualifying interview plus field intake system is used by the district offices to determine eligibility. Staff is allotted to the intake divisions on the same basis as resident cases and little consideration is given to the additional work involved in serving transient families. Each field case aide is expected to carry a case load in excess of 55 families. This results in the service rendered being quite mechanical in nature and consists mainly of temporary care, verification of residence, and transportation.

D. STAFF ATTITUDE

The attitude of the staff serving transients is somewhat difficult to define. When asked for opinions as to how the State relief administration policy toward transient relief might be changed, their reactions varied from those which seemed to indicate they felt the previous policy was totally unsocial, to those best exemplified by the statement of one of the group to the effect; "The majority of transient families bring little of value to California and should be returned to their legal residences as soon as possible, lest they become a burden to the community."

The confusion in the minds of the staff probably results from the strict enforcement, during the past several years, of the policy of returning transient families to their legal residence, irrespective of what may await them in these communities. Undoubtedly any indication that the State relief administration intends to approach the problem in a more social manner would be received in an enthusiastic fashion by the staff charged with the responsibility of caring for transients.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Policy changes:

(*a*) The literal enforcement of the policy of returning transient families to their legal residences should be changed to a policy which takes into account:

(*x*) The welfare of the family.
(*y*) The family's plan for its future well-being.
(*z*) The conditions from which the family is attempting to escape.

(*b*) In general, emphasis might well be placed upon returning to legal residence, but it should be in conjunction with cooperative planning by the family and the State relief administration, and not by taking advantage of the economic distress of the family.

(*c*) Families should not be denied relief solely for the reason they refused to accept transportation to legal residences.

(*d*) Recognition should be taken of the fact that it is not to the economic advantage of this country to create stranded communities in nonproductive areas, i. e., Dust Bowl area, solely for the reason they cannot secure relief elsewhere, as is the case under the English dole system.

(*e*) Families whom it is determined inadvisable to return to legal residences, should be afforded the same type care rendered resident families in order that they may have an opportunity to make an adequate adjustment in this community, i. e., certification to Work Projects Administration, National Youth Administration, and Civilian Conservation Corps placement for younger members of the family group, and medical care.

2. Organizational changes:

(*a*) There should be established a transient family welfare division under a well-trained supervisor. This division may have office space in several of the district offices but the personnel of the division should be responsible to the supervisor of the transient family division and not to the district director. The reason for this change in responsibility is to assure close supervision of this rather technical problem and the enforcement of a uniform policy.

(*b*) Staff needs: Caseworkers should be allotted to the intake division on the basis of 1 to every 20 applications per week, and to the field units on the basis of 1 to every 50 active cases.

This increase in the allotment of personnel is based on the increased amount of work incident to the care of transient families and to the technical skill required. The allotment of case supervisors and clerical workers should be on the same basis as at present, i. e. case supervisors—1 to 5 case aides. Clerical—2 to 3 professional persons.

V. Single Women

A. POLICY

The policy for determining the eligibility for relief of transient single women has in general been the same as that in effect for transient families. Until recently, as in the case of transient boys and families, consent to return to legal residence was a condition precedent to relief. Since February 9, 1939, the policy has been to accept single women for temporary relief pending verification of residence and authorization to return, without insisting upon an agreement to return to legal residence at the time application for relief is made. However, when authorization for return is secured transportation is offered and if refused relief is discontinued.

The strict enforcement of this policy of return to legal residence has placed the burden of caring for single women on already overtaxed private agencies. Not all of the single women refused relief by the State relief administration find their way to private agencies and can only hazard a guess as to the means to which they must resort in order to maintain themselves.

B. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Statistics are not available as to the number of applications the State relief administration received from transient single women during 1938. We do know however that 548 women were accepted for temporary care and transportation to legal residence. On the basis of these acceptances, it is probably fair to assume that over 1,000 applications were received.

The Travelers Aid Society reports that it has been caring for between 25 and 30 girls per month, whose applications were rejected by the State relief administration for refusing to consent to return to their legal residences.

During 1938, 534 cases of single transient women were closed. Unfortunately the State relief administration statistical report does not tell us the final disposition of these women.

C. FACILITIES FOR THE CARE OF SINGLE TRANSIENT WOMEN

The workers assigned to the care of transient families are also charged with the responsibility of serving transient single women. (See portion of report dealing with transient families.)

In addition the Travelers Aid Society has a small fund given it by the Pepperdine family, which enables that agency to care for single women coming to its attention. The women are placed in the Brandon Guest House and the Mary Martha Home. The executive secretary for the Travelers Aid Society reports that the majority of these women find private employment and become self-sustaining.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Policy changes:

(*a*) The present policy of temporary care pending return to legal residence should be changed to a more constructive policy which meets the needs of these women and recognizes that frequently return to legal residence is worse than no plan.

(*b*) Recognition should be taken of the fact that transient single women in the main are attempting to escape from either a real or fanciful situation which to them has become unbearable.

(*c*) Recognition should also be taken of the fact that transiency among single women is not always due to unemployment and that it is necessary to approach the problem in a more skilled fashion than is ordinarily necessary in the instance of a simple unemployment relief problem.

(*d*) Approved housing facilities for single women made available by private social agencies, should be used when these units have something constructive to offer these women.

(*e*) Social planning for single transient women should be done in cooperation with the women themselves. The objective of such planning should always be a socially desirable solution of their problems and not an arbitrary return to a legal residence.

2. Organizational changes:

The organizational changes suggested under the section of this report dealing with transient families, would probably meet the needs of unattached transient women.

VI. Single Men

A. PRESENT POLICY

Since the liquidation of the Federal Transient Service in September 1935, the policy of the State relief administration toward single transient men has been as set forth in chapter I, section D, page 10 of the social service division manual: "In general, transient unattached employable men are not eligible for any relief. Exceptions may be made to this policy only when in the opinion of the social service supervisor the circumstances of a particular case warrant special consideration. Such circumstance might arise in the case of a man of substantial background who has made an unsuccessful attempt to establish himself in employment, or a man with definite family ties elsewhere who has good social reasons for returning to such place of legal residence."

The fact that the State relief administration in Los Angeles County had under care on February 23, 1939, only two transient single men would indicate that the exception to the general policy of no relief to single transient men is not very generously applied to individual cases.

B. PROBLEM

As is true in the instance of transient boys, the lack of a central registration bureau and adequate facilities for their care makes any estimate of the size of the problem most difficult. However, there are certain figures available which indicate to some extent at least the problem.

The director of the Midnight Mission reports that over 1,500 transient men find shelter each night by the following means:

Midnight Mission	150
Union Rescue Mission	200
Motion-picture houses	1, 200

The limited facilities available in the form of mission care compel men to seek shelter in all-night motion-picture shows. There are six of these establishments on Main Street which charge a 5-cent admission fee and permit their customers to remain until 5 o'clock in the morning.

The only available estimate of single transient men entering the city of Los Angeles via freight trains, is that supplied the police department by the three major railroads and covers the period of from May to October 1937. The railroad officials estimated that 28,929 entered the city during this period.

The Los Angeles city annual police report for the fiscal year 1937–38, shows that 12,585 men over 21 years of age were arrested on vagrancy charges. Of those arrested 5,276 were between the ages of 22 and 29, inclusive; 2,824 were from 30 to 39 years, inclusive, and 2,364 were over 40 years of age.

The council of social agencies advises me that transient unattached men compose the largest single unmet social problem in Los Angeles County.

C. FACILITIES FOR CARE

Other than the mission, jails, and all-night theaters mentioned previously, there are practically no facilities for the care of transient single men.

During 1937 the city of Los Angeles appropriated $12,000 to care for transient unattached men. The money was spent under a contract with the community chest of Los Angeles. A central registration bureau was maintained for the period February 1 to June 30, and men were allowed a maximum of 3 day's care at the Midnight Mission. At the end of this time they were requested to leave the city by the police department. No money was appropriated for this purpose by the city during 1938.

The council of social agencies plans to present a request to the social service commission on March 7, 1939, that it include in its budget the sum of $15,000 in order that 200 men per day may be provided with two meals and a bed for a 3-day period during the latter half of the fiscal year commencing January 1940. A modified work program in connection with the park and fire department is contemplated. No request is being made for a registration bureau. This problem will probably be met by one of the private agencies.

It should be noted that the request of the council of social agencies goes no further than to suggest a plan of care that calls for only 3 day's relief, with the inference that the man must then leave town.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Policy:

(*a*) The State relief administration must recognize its responsibility for the care of employable transient unattached men.

(*b*) Recognition should be taken of the fact that the so-called bindle stiff or hobo is a thing of the past and in their place we have a very large number of comparatively young homeless men needing care. (See statistics arrest on vagrancy charge.)

(*c*) The present negative policy of the State relief administration should be changed to a positive one providing at least a minimum amount of care.

2. Form that relief should take:

(*a*) A program of camp care should be the minimum that is made available for transient men.

(*b*) It would be advisable to develop productive work programs in these camps flexible enough to gear into any Work Projects Administration program for transients that might result from the President's request to Colonel Harrington, Work Projects Administration Administrator, that the Work Projects Administration attempt to alleviate California's transient problem.

(*c*) Provision should be made for care outside of camp on a selective basis which should take into consideration the individual's welfare.

3. Facilities needed:

(*a*) A registration bureau for transient unattached men.

(*b*) An overnight housing unit which would accommodate approximately 200 men. The State relief administration should gear into the facilities that may be made available by the city of Los Angeles, or failing this, make use of existing private facilities.

(*c*) Camp facilities for at least 1,000 men during the winter and 300 during the summer should be provided.

4. Staff:

(*a*) Central registration bureau:

Supervisor of Bureau.
Case aides, 1 to every 20 applications received per day.
Clerical, 2 to every 3 professional person employed.

(*b*) Housing unit:

Supervisors	1
Assistant supervisor	1
First cook	1
Second cook	1
Supervisor of maintenance work	1
Clerical	4

(*c*) Camps:

	Each camp
Camp superintendent	1
Assistant camp superintendent	1
Recreational leader	1
Supervisor of work projects	1
First-aid man (registered nurse)	1
First cook	1
Second cook	1
Clerical	3

(*d*) Social service staff:

Supervisor of men's division	1
Secretary to supervisor of men's division	1

Case supervisors, 1 to each 5 case workers.

Case workers: It is estimated that 1 case worker would be required for every 100 men receiving care. It is intended that only a selective group would benefit by the service of a case worker.

VII. Medical Care

A. PROBLEM

In general the eligibility of transients for medical care is determined upon the same basis as that for relief. The only exception to this policy is that the residence requirements are waived by General Hospital in the instance of acute emergencies.

Transient clients of the State relief administration receive the same medical service as other relief recipients. This service is very limited and is not intended to meet chronic ailments.

Private agencies, i. e., All Nations and Santa Rita Clinics, as well as the Cedars of Lebanon and White Memorial Hospitals, occasionally render medical service to transients. Since the resources of these agencies are limited they cannot be looked to for extensive service to this group.

The problem of medical attention for transients revolves itself to the single statement, "Facilities are available to meet only acute emergencies."

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the medical division of the State relief administration take under consideration the problem of medical care for transients and develop a program of service which will more completely meet their needs. Service similar to that rendered by the Agricultural Workers Health and Medical Association is undoubtedly needed in Los Angeles County.

VIII. Conclusion

A. COMMITTEES

The Federal Transient Service was vulnerable to arbitrary termination by administrative order in September 1935, because it fell short of attaining one of its essential objectives, i. e., community support. This objective may only be attained by means of an educational campaign by informed citizen committees. For this reason it is recommended that there be appointed a general transient committee, which in turn should appoint subcommittees to approach each problem of transiency, i. e. boys, single women, families, unattached men, and the difficulties in obtaining medical care for these groups.

This general committee should serve in an advisory capacity to the administrative person in charge of the transient program in southern California, while the subcommittees should be advisory to the supervisors of the subdivisions of the transient program.

B. PERSONNEL CHART


SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DIRECTOR
TRANSIENT DIVISION
Supervisor of Boys' Division
Supervisor Case Workers
Supervisor Transient Boys' Registration Bureau
Supervisor of Family and Single Women's Division
Camp Superintendents
Case Supervisors and Case Workers
Supervisor of Single Men's Division
Supervisor of Central Intake
Social Service Supervisor
Camp Superintendents

C. The transient program should at all times be one that is flexible enough to gear into any Federal proposals which may result from the President's recent request of Colonel Harrington. It should also take full advantage of the facilities for the care of transients which have been made available by the Farm Security Administration, the Work Projects Administration, and the Agricultural Workers' Health and Medical Association.

The CHAIRMAN. We will adjourn until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., an adjournment was taken to 1:30 p. m., of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(After the taking of a recess, the hearing was resumed at 1:30 p. m.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

Mr. Montgomery?

TESTIMONY OF MARVIN MONTGOMERY AND HARVEY MONTGOMERY, SHAFTER, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. Give your full name, Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Marvin Montgomery.

The CHAIRMAN. Marvin?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I am 57.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you live?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I live at Shafter, the migratory camp.

The CHAIRMAN. Shafter, Calif.?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Son, what is your name?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Harvey.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you, Harvey?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Seventeen.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you living with dad?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How many in your family?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Six.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. How many girls?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. One.

The CHAIRMAN. How many boys?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Three.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I was born at Little Rock, Ark.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do there?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. What did I do there?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I didn't stay there long. My father moved from there to Newport and we farmed in Jackson County.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a farm family?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes; oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And why did you leave there, Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Why did I leave there?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. My father decided to come West and he came to the Indian Territory. It was Indian Territory in them days when we left Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many in your family, your father's family?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. There were seven of us.

The CHAIRMAN. And you moved——

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY (interrupting). Nine in all, you know. There was five boys, two girls, my father, and mother.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the Indian Territory?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, when we came, you know, when we came west in 1898, we came to the Cherokee Nation. It was all a Territory where we come to then; that is west of Fort Smith, Ark., right over across the river from Fort Smith was all Indian Territory, the Cherokee Nation, the Choctaw and the Osage, Seminole, Creek. It was not Oklahoma then.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what did you do then, in brief, Mr. Montgomery? You farmed, did you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. In the Territory?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long did you remain there farming?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, the place where we moved to, the town was Sallisaw. We lived there 10 years and then we moved across the river into the Choctaw side, you know, which is Stigler now. I lived there 30 years.

The CHAIRMAN. And how old were you when you left there?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. When I left?

The CHAIRMAN. You lived there 30 years, you said?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Thirty years when I left Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you moved over there and lived there 30 years?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. And lived there 30 years. How old was I when I left there?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. And come to this country?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Fifty-five.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you have been here 2 years?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes; going on 3; will be the 15th of next February.

The CHAIRMAN. And what caused you to leave there?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. To leave Oklahoma?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, under the farming conditions, you know, the drought and such as that, it just got so hard, such a hard get-by, I decided it would help me to change countries. If I made any change—I decided to change and maybe it would help me.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you couldn't make it go there? Is that the idea?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, no; I might have drug by like some of the rest of them, and sort of lived. I just drug along as long as I wanted to. I wanted to change countries to see if I couldn't find something better.

The Chairman. And when you left there did you have in mind the State you were going to?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. The State I was going to?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir. I knew right where I was coming to.

The Chairman. And what is the name of that State?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. California.

The Chairman. You see, we want to get this in this record. I know you think you are just talking to me, but we have to look at this record after you make your remarks.

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. What caused you to move? Was it advertising or what someone had told you?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. No, sir; there was no advertising, nothing that caused me to come to this country. It got hard back there, you know, as I said; it was just a hard old going. I figured it would help me to change.

The Chairman. Was the climate here in this country any inducement for you to come here?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. No; I don't know as it was.

The Chairman. Was it relief?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. It certainly was not. It was work, was what I was really looking for.

The Chairman. I see.

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. I say it was work was what I was really looking for. I couldn't get to work back there.

The Chairman. Well, when did you leave Oklahoma to come here?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. December 29, 1937.

The Chairman. And who came with you?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. My family.

The Chairman. Well, how many in the family?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Six.

The Chairman. And how did you come?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Come in a car.

The Chairman. An automobile?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. What kind of a car?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. A Hudson Super six, '29.

The Chairman. '29?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Eight years old, was it not? It was 8 years old?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes. It was a '29 model, '29 Hudson; yes.

The Chairman. So you loaded the family up and you struck out for California?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. How much money did you have?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. When I sold out and got my car and everything ready I had $53 in money when I started to leave there. On the way, you know my car—I got to where I had to blindfold it to get it past a filling station. It was taking on lots of gas and oil. I had two break-downs, too, and I had to stop at Eloy for 5 weeks and pick cotton before I could come on over here.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought I had heard, or rather the committee has heard, nearly every expression, but I think you have coined a new one. You had to blindfold your automobile?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes. It used so much oil.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To get it by a filling station.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get it by?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Did I get by?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I got to California.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would you stay at night?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I stayed at tourist camps.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they generally charge you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, about one and a half. They charged me two and a half at Yuma and one and a half at Ft. Worth and it was one and a half at Douglas. We drove all night one night. We didn't stay every night at a tourist camp. We drove one night all night long and didn't stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The six of you all go into one camp?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any trouble at the State borders?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Not a bit in the world; not a bit. I didn't have any trouble at all, whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. What highway did you travel?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. 66. We traveled 80 from Fort Worth to El Paso. You know we came by El Paso. I don't know—I don't remember what highway it was all the way that I traveled on. I was on several different highways. I can tell the route, the towns I came through.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, don't do that.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. What did you say?

The CHAIRMAN. Don't give us all the route or we will be traveling that now until tomorrow morning, don't you see. What I would like to know, of course, and what I am getting at, is how you got along on the way. You knew where you were going and that was to the State of California?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I knew exactly where I was going. I had a son and a married daughter here.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. The money got a little low? It was getting low all the time, was it?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you try to get any employment on the way to California?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I stopped 5 weeks and picked cotton at Eloy, Ariz. I had to stop.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your children help you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes; they helped me; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you make at that?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I made all the way from 20—cotton picking—the cotton was good there, but we couldn't pick much. You couldn't pick much cotton in that tall rank cotton. We made something like $4 and $5 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you live when you were picking cotton?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. They furnished us a tent to live in.

The CHAIRMAN. A tent for the six of you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How big was the tent?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. It was 12 by 14.

The CHAIRMAN. You had your own bedding, did you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, yes; I had that old car loaded to the full capacity, on top, the sides, and everywhere else—the back end.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a pretty good mechanic? You understood that car?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. No; I am no mechanic at all.

The CHAIRMAN. But that car knew you and you knew the car?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes; I got acquainted with it on the road. I found out it would use oil and gas.

The CHAIRMAN. It was a good oil burner?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. It certainly was.

The CHAIRMAN. Lots of times you thought you had a steam engine, I suppose?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Almost; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what part of California did you come to?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. To Shafter.

The CHAIRMAN. I am following this up for the record.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And what did you do there at Shafter?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. When I first came here?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I stayed a week with my son-in-law and daughter, out north of Wasco, and then I moved into that Government camp.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long did you stay there?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. In the camp? I lived in the tent there 9 months.

The CHAIRMAN. In a tent?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How large was the tent?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, 14 by 16. That is the size, the space that is in the tent.

The CHAIRMAN. Six of you?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay any money there for camp privileges or anything?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I paid rent, you know.

The CHAIRMAN. How much rent?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Ten cents a day. That started the first of June. I worked out my rent, though, the 1st of June, and then the rent started and I paid 10 cents a day, $3 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that price fluctuate much, that 10 cents a day?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Did it which?

The CHAIRMAN. Did it fluctuate much, 8, 9, 10, or 11, or was it all the same price, 10 cents?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. All the same price, 10 cents a day, and $4 work that you were told to do at the 1st of the month, so I always got that off my chest the 1st of the month.

The Chairman. And how long did you stay there?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Nine months.

The Chairman. And during that time what work did you do?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Well, I hoed beets some; hoed some cotton, and I picked up spuds. That is principally the work that I did.

The Chairman. Is your wife living?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes; yes, sir.

The Chairman. And did she work any at all with you?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. No.

The Chairman. In the field?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. No, just me.

The Chairman. And the boys?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. And the girls. I have two girls. I just gotten one at home now. One of them is back in Oklahoma—Tulsa.

The Chairman. And after living there 9 months, where did you go then?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. I moved into one of the Federal houses, in house 31.

The Chairman. That is a Farm Security camp?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. One of the farm camps?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. What do you pay there?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. $8.20 a month.

The Chairman. A month?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. What sort of a house have you?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. I have a two-room house.

The Chairman. Water and everything?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Water, lights, and everything; yes, sir; and a little garden spot furnished.

The Chairman. And you are there now?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir. I am there now.

The Chairman. Are you satisfied, and the family?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Well, I reckon I am pretty well satisfied.

The Chairman. What are your ambitions? What are your hopes?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Well, if I had things like I want, I would rather be set up somewhere back on a farm, back in the East. I can't say that I like this country, but then there isn't anything back in the East. I would rather be back on the farm, if you want to know. I was born and raised on a farm; a farmer. That is what I like. I raise livestock and poultry and such of my own, you know.

The Chairman. Yes; Mr. Montgomery. We have talked to witnesses like you in New York and Alabama, Illinois, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And I would say that nearly 100 percent would rather be back home on their own farms running them, if they could stay there, but there comes a time when you can't stay there.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, that is it.

The CHAIRMAN. The drought and wind and one thing and another; the soil wearing out and you cannot stay there, so you start out?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, right now you feel that you are doing for you and your family the best you can do?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I certainly do, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any criticism about the conduct of these farm camps?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. No; absolutely not.

The CHAIRMAN. You are treated all right?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. All right; no complaint.

The CHAIRMAN. How many at your camp? How many people in the camp?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. In the camp?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I don't know just now just how many is in there. The camp is not full, you know. There is 240 spaces, you know, in there; room for 240 tents and then the 40 houses.

The CHAIRMAN. How, Mr. Montgomery, do you graduate from a tent to a house? You start in in a tent and then you work up to a house? Is that the idea? Or how is it? What do you do about it?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, you want me to tell you how I got my house?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear it.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. I had been there and Bob Hardy was camp manager at that time. Well, you know, when people start paying rent there in the camp, he had lots of trouble, you know, and couldn't collect the rents hardly and people would move out—and do now—they do that now sometimes. But always, at the first of the month, I went down and paid my rent, you know, and done my 4 hours' work and got that off my mind so I could go ahead and do my other work.

Well, along about the first of August when people was putting in applications for the houses, he come to me one day and he said, "Mr. Montgomery, why don't you put in an application for a house?"

Well, I said there wouldn't be any use for me to, I don't think, as I haven't been here long enough.

"If you will put in application, I will do all I can to help get you in there."

So I went down and put in an application and I got one of the houses. That is the way I got it. Mr. Hardy filled out and signed the contract when it came in.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Montgomery, have you ever been on relief?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Right there where I am living now, Shafter, in that camp. I have been on relief.

The CHAIRMAN. How were you entitled to relief? You didn't live there long enough, did you?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is Farm Security.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh yes, Farm Security. You are not on State relief, are you? You are not on State relief, you are on Farm Security relief?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, it is the State relief administration, whatever you might call it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is the State relief, the State relief administration. How did you get by the residence requirements? How long did you live there before you got relief?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. In one of the houses?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I was there about 4 months.

The CHAIRMAN. How much relief did you get a month?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, about $52 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. $52 a month?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am trying to get in my mind is how you were qualified, under the residence law. You weren't there long enough. How long did you have to be there before you got State relief, State relief administration?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I don't know. The first relief that I had was the Farm Security Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. I know.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. They transferred from the Farm Security Administration to the State relief administration at Bakersfield and that is all I can tell you about it.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, when you got it you didn't turn it back, is that the idea? You were glad to get it and needed it?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; I certainly was glad to get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you claim your residence now? You are a resident of the State of California?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; I can vote here in California.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you voted?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; I voted.

The CHAIRMAN. I noticed a decision at Woodland, Calif., the other day, where the court held that you had a right to vote, don't you see.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me about you, son. You are 17?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your first name?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. Harvey.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you like this traveling around the country?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. I don't like it so well.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't like it. You would rather be back home, would you?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. I like California.

The CHAIRMAN. You like California? Are you going to school?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How long since you have gone to school?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. I went last year.

The CHAIRMAN. How long?

Mr. HARVEY MONTGOMERY. All school term.

The CHAIRMAN. And what grade are you in?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. I passed to the ninth.

The Chairman. Passed the ninth?

Mr. Sparkman. Passed to the ninth.

The Chairman. You passed to the ninth?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. What do you intend to make out of yourself, Harvey?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. I guess just work on a farm.

The Chairman. Work on the farm?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. With dad?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. Do you remember Oklahoma?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. Would you rather go back there?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. No. I would rather stay out here.

The Chairman. And you and the family think that you are doing the very best you can under the circumstances?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. Yes.

The Chairman. Waiting for something to break?

Mr. Harvey Montgomery. Yes, I guess so.

Mr. Sparkman. Two of your children are married, is that right?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. And you have four children at home?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes. Well, I have a grown boy who once in a while eats at home, but who is most of the time off at work. His name is Raymond. He is 24 years old.

Mr. Sparkman. Is Harvey the only one home regularly?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. And what are the ages of the others?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. The other boys?

Mr. Sparkman. The other children.

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. One is 15, you know; another one 16 months old. There is a little difference in their ages.

Mr. Sparkman. The one that is 15, is that a boy or a girl?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. A boy.

Mr. Sparkman. Well, that is three. Then there is another one?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. The girl, you know. She is 21.

Mr. Sparkman. Is she married?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. No.

Mr. Sparkman. You lived 9 months in a tent, is that right?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Those tents are just one-room affairs?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, just in a tent.

Mr. Sparkman. And you paid 10 cents a day for that?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. And you paid $8.20 for the house?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Now, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Tolan was asking you about how you got the house. They require a certain annual income before they let you have the house, don't they?

Mr. Marvin Montgomery. Yes, sir; supposed to.

Mr. Sparkman. Four or five or six hundred dollars, something like that?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now that is a two-room house with a garden plot?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do all your children work, except the baby?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. No. The other one goes to school. He works when he is not in school.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He is 15?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir. He is in school.

Mr. SPARKMAN. About this relief, you came to California in 1937, is that right?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well now, it was '38 when I came in. You know I stopped.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You stopped at Arizona?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. December 29, in '37, but then I stopped at Eloy, Ariz., and picked cotton 5 weeks. It was February 8 when I crossed at Yuma.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When was it when you were transferred from the Farm Security relief over to the State relief?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. The State relief administration?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. Well, I don't know as I could tell you.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was it this year or last year?

Mr. MARVIN MONTGOMERY. It was last year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

(Witnesses excused.)

(The following letter was later received, in regard to the above witness, from the Administrator of the California State Relief Administration:)

CALIFORNIA STATE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 11, 1940.

Congressman JOHN TOLAN,
Tolan Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOLAN: At a committee meeting held in Kern County on September 28, a Mr. Marvin Montgomery appeared to give testimony. In the course of this testimony, according to newspaper reports, Mr. Montgomery said he received aid from the Federal Farm Security Administration 1 week after entering California 2 years ago. Four months later the family was transferred to the State relief administration. There was some surprise expressed that Mr. Montgomery so soon received State relief administration aid in view of the 1-year residence requirement.

We asked our Kern County office for a clearance concerning this case, particularly with regard to residence. We should like to give you a brief statement which shows that the family was in this State slightly more than 1 year at the time State relief administration accepted the case.

The family first made application for aid in May 1938 to the Farm Security Administration and was accepted by them. They gave information that they had entered California in February 1938. The family was accepted by the State relief administration on February 22, 1939. However, we had had contact with the children in July 1938, when two of them requested National Youth Administration certification. It would appear that Mr. Montgomery was in error when he said that State relief administration accepted his application and granted relief after he had been in the State 4 months.

We give you this information in order that your files on this case may be complete.

Yours very truly,

S. G. RUBINOW,
Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Schreiber.

TESTIMONY OF LAWRENCE C. SCHREIBER, CHIEF DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, DEPARTMENT OF CHARITIES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Schreiber, will you give your name and title to the reporter, for the benefit of the record?

Mr. SCHREIBER. Lawrence C. Schreiber, S-c-h-r-e-i-b-e-r; chief deputy superintendent, department of charities, Los Angeles County.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Schreiber, have you submitted——

Mr. SCHREIBER (interposing). I haven't personally submitted a report, but the department of charities has submitted a series of reports to the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. We have those. Suppose you just make a statement as you wish.

Mr. SCHREIBER. Well, there is no particular statement, gentlemen, that I wish to make other than that which already appears in your records. I am here to answer any questions you might have to ask.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Los Angeles Department of Charities, what is the nature of that? Is it operated by the city?

Mr. SCHREIBER. No; the Los Angeles County Department of Charities is operated by the county of Los Angeles.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a county association?

Mr. SCHREIBER. Yes; and it consists of four divisions—four operating divisions. There is the General Hospital which takes care of the acutely ill; the Olive View Sanitarium which takes care of tuberculars, the poor farm which takes care of the infirm or incapacitated, and the bureau of indigent relief which is again divided into two sections taking care of general relief cases, aged, and dependent children, and the aid of the needy blind and old-age security.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is that the county set-up which ties in with the social security?

Mr. SCHREIBER. Yes. That is a county set-up.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it a part of the State relief administration?

Mr. SCHREIBER. No. It has no connection whatever with the State relief administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You have two separate—you have a separate welfare department to handle social security matters and then you have a separate State relief association, is that right?

Mr. SCHREIBER. I don't know whether I quite get your question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am trying to get this in my mind. You have two separate agencies to handle those different functions. One is a State relief association which handles direct relief with no connection with the Federal Government?

Mr. SCHREIBER. Well, let me explain it this way: Within the bureau of indigent relief of the department of charities we have two divisions that are within the bureau, the one division handling our general relief cases, that is, the unemployable unemployed, and the cases which are composed of State aid to the needy children; then in the other division of the bureau of indigent relief, all operating within the department of charities, we care for those persons who qualify for old-age security and aid to the needy blind. It is, however, one division, one bureau of the department of charities.

Now then again, in Los Angeles County, we have an office of the State relief administration which, of course, is entirely different; an entirely different organization, caring for the employable unemployed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, I see. You take care of the relief cases for the unemployable unemployed?

Mr. SCHREIBER. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the State relief association handles those that are employable?

Mr. SCHREIBER. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it a very heavy load that you are called on to carry?

Mr. SCHREIBER. Well, the department of charities at the present time has approximately 100,000 cases.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is in Los Angeles County?

Mr. SCHREIBER. That is including all categories of relief.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In this county?

Mr. SCHREIBER. In this county; yes, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do you run into the migrant problem very much, or are yours principally your regular and long-time residents?

Mr. SCHREIBER. No. As a general thing I would imagine that the State relief administration is faced with a greater problem in connection with migrants than the department of charities. However, it is a problem to us because, as you have noticed in the report, there are approximately 220 or 225 cases that we have to turn away, per month, who are unemployable and who do not qualify under the residence laws of the State of California, and a very much larger number than that, I imagine, would be turned away by the State relief administration.

RESIDENCE LAWS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Schreiber, you mentioned the residence laws of California. We have run into difficulty with that every place we have been. We find, just as we learned in connection with some witnesses we had here this morning, coming away from their home States, they usually lose their residence after the lapse of a year. In fact, if they come away with the intention of establishing themselves elsewhere, they lose it immediately, and yet we find a tendency on the part of so many of the States to set the required time to acquire residence very high, up as high as 5 years which I believe is the maximum under the social-security law. I wonder if you have any suggestions or thoughts to give to us regarding that great variance in residence requirements, and particularly that 2-, 3-, or 4-year gap there during which time a person is not a resident, technically speaking, of any State and is not entitled to relief from any State whatsoever.

Mr. SCHREIBER. Yes. We have given considerable thought to that, and it seems that about the only way that something really constructive could be accomplished along that line, and quickly, would be through a Federal participation in the entire program.

It would, it seems to me, at least, be impossible, through influence or pressure or any other method to get all States in the Union to adopt uniform settlement laws or uniform residence laws in order to qualify for relief, but there is the possibility—and that has been proven through the Social Security Act, such as the old-age pension and the aid for the needy blind—that if the Federal Government were to step into the program and, in participation with the States, set up a program in which both the State and the Federal Government would participate, the Federal Government by regulation setting up certain standards and certain residence requirements—in other words, for each State to qualify for the aid that would be given by the Federal Government—that is the only and quickest way to effect what I think you gentlemen are attempting to accomplish.

Now, along with that, of course, in order to make it impossible—or not impossible, but at least possible to set up again another category of relief in the United States that would be setting back just living on relief—it seems to me that it would be necessary to establish a uniform employment service sponsored by the Federal Government to influence and control the flow and market—the flow of labor and the market over the United States—and it seems to me at this time that is about the only possible chance of arriving at a quick solution.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Schreiber. We appreciate your appearance here very much. We are pretty well hooked up with your views, don't you see, in our records throughout the case. Thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCarthy.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES PATRICK McCARTHY, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. Your name is James McCarthy?

Mr. McCARTHY. James Patrick McCarthy; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. McCarthy, where are you living now?

Mr. McCARTHY. At 2720 South Raymond, Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. And where were you born?

Mr. McCARTHY. Winchester, Va.

The CHAIRMAN. When?

Mr. McCARTHY. March 13, 1896.

The CHAIRMAN. You are 44 years old?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you live with your family there after that?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, sir. I was born there and my mother and father went to St. Louis, Mo. I lost my mother at the age of 18 months. Then I never saw my father until I received word of his death in 1920, and then I didn't get to see him because he died in New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, who did you stay with, Jim?

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, after my mother died I stayed with my aunt up until I was 11 years old, when my aunt moved away. From there on I was practically on my own.

Then when the duration of the war came out I enlisted for the duration of the war and stayed in after I came out. I just had taken up athletic work, been traveling around the country with different show organizations and meeting all comers in different places up until '33. From '33 I got married—in '33—and then I worked in and around Philadelphia, in and out of there up until 1937. I got with a show again and I came out, started west, working with shows all the way out.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you in the war?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I was in for the duration of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The duration?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you in any battles over there?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No. I was on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. On this side?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But you were in the entire time?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you drawing any pension?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I haven't that much disability.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you not getting any disability compensation?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, sir. I am not getting any disability compensation at all.

The CHAIRMAN. No service-connected disability?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No. I don't have any service-connected disability at all.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Was anything ever done about it?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a trouble, angina pectoris?

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is what they claim. I have never had any indications of it. I just got a preliminary examination at the General Hospital and the doctor out there just asked a few questions. He just went over me slightly with a stethoscope. He asked "What is your ailment?"

"None so far as I know, only a slight cold and possibly a few chest things once in a while."

That was all that was said. I was only stripped down as far as my waist. He never asked me any more questions after that.

Then, when I came back—I will bring the story out plain—the first, the starting of it, was that after my wife's second child was born, my wife came home from the hospital. Well then, I had an order to go into the W. P. A., which I fulfilled the order and went to work on the W. P. A. Then my wife taken sick and had to go to bed with the baby and I had another small boy, 20 months old now. I couldn't walk out and leave them. I inquired for a housekeeper at the W. P. A. Well, they sent me one out and she stayed a day and a half and walked off. I couldn't go to work. I couldn't walk out and leave my wife and baby and small boy in the house by themselves. I stayed off the usual 5 days and the wife got better and then I went out to report back on the job and I got a dismissal for 5 days' absence.

Well, then, they referred me back to the S. R. A. Well, I went back to the S. R. A. and I made contact there. They told me at the time to go out to the General Hospital for this examination. Well, I went out for an examination, and that is the report that they got on the examination. Well, when I reported back to the lady in charge, the supervisor, why then she informed me that she had to transfer me, that I was totally unemployable and the S. R. A. had to have one employable member in the family, and my wife being with a nursing baby, she was unemployable, and I was declared totally unemployable. They turned my case over to the county.

Well, that was on the 21st of June—not June, pardon me—the 21st of August. Well, I stayed on the county then and went down and reported down there and got back on the county.

Well, in the meantime, by going down to Eighth and Wilson and applying for reemployment on the W. P. A., I received another work order. Well, immediately when I got the work order I went down to the county agent and told him that I got a work order to go to work on the W. P. A., and then they said, "We will stop your case right now. Go to work with the W. P. A."

I started to go to work and when I got out there I found the order was canceled by me being totally unemployable. They sent me back down to the county. Well, then they advised me, asked me did I want to go back to the State of Pennsylvania. I told them that I didn't think I could establish residence back in the State of Pennsylvania because, under this, I hadn't been there long enough at one time to establish residence.

Well, then, they kept me on until the 25th of this month, on the county. Then they give me a grocery order at intervals each week. That was $5.27 a week. At the end of each week I went down to get grocery orders. I got the acceptance last time. I went down after the grocery order, on the day it was due, and they told me that I was cut completely off.

The Chairman. And you are off now entirely?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. You have a wife and two children?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. How old are the children?

Mr. McCarthy. One is 4 years and the other 20 months.

The Chairman. Well, then, what are you living on now?

Mr. McCarthy. Nothing right now; got to do the best I can until I can get straightened out.

The Chairman. Do the best you can and keep on praying?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. You were a boxer, too, weren't you?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes; I have fought some professional fighters. That was long before they became champions, like Mickey Walker.

The Chairman. What is your weight?

Mr. McCarthy. My weight is 191.

The Chairman. Is that it now?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes.

The Chairman. You haven't lost any weight, perceptibly, have you?

Mr. McCarthy. No, sir; I have not.

The Chairman. You consider yourself a well man, do you?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes, sir; I can get out. I am a painter by trade and I can get out and I can pull a swing up four or five stories and work there all day, or I can work at any height. I can do any hard floor work. I specialize in refinishing floors. That is pretty hard work. You get a pretty tired body when you are working at it. Then I am around colors all the time, mixing colors.

The Chairman. You look like a pretty healthy man to me. I would hate to tangle with you.

Mr. McCarthy. I am pretty good.

The Chairman. You have traveled a good deal around the United States, haven't you?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Now, how did you travel with the children and the wife?

Mr. McCarthy. As soon as I found out that the children were going to come—that is the first one—I immediately got a job with the United States engineers. That is when they had it here in Los Angeles, working on the river project. I got a job there and it lasted 4 months.

Well, after that, why I had a little surplus money to go on. I went on until November of 1938 and I found out my wife was in the condition she was—she slipped and she fell on a pair of steps—well then I seen I would have to have a doctor. That was my only out, right at the time, not having the money I had to apply for relief. I applied for relief and got what they call transient aid. That was up until—from November until around the 13th of March. It was on my birthday. I was lucky enough to get a job with the Griffith Construction Co., as night watchman.

Well, I went down and reported to the relief and had myself cut off of relief and I went to work then. Then that job continued for a couple of months. In the meantime I moved from Fremont, that is in Los Angeles County, to Huntington Park.

In the meantime I kept in contact with the State employment office. Well, as it happened, I was lucky out there. There was a veteran in charge there, a pretty decent sort of a fellow, and he looked after the veterans very exclusively. He kept in contact with all the jobs that came in there available, and the veterans got them if it was possible they could do it. I kept that up until I think it was in January of '39 and then I found that I was unable to get any more work, and work was pretty slack, and I went back on relief. They gave me a year's residence requirement at the time, reopened my case and put me back on relief.

Then, after that, I stayed on relief up until they transferred me to the W. P. A. and that is when this other trouble started.

The Chairman. Well, what I am concerned with is your future, Mr. McCarthy. Did you ever make application to the Veterans' Administration for Federal compensation?

Mr. McCarthy. At one time, and that was in '34 and I was turned down. I didn't have enough disability at that time. At that time I think they required 25 percent disability.

The Chairman. We passed a bill recently reducing that down to 10 percent. Did you know about that?

Mr. McCarthy. No, I didn't know about that. I never made application since then.

The Chairman. I would be glad to have you write either Congressman Sparkman or myself, at Washington, about that, and ask, under the new law, where you might fit in. Be sure and tell us just what they did with your prior application and give us your case number, if possible, don't you see?

Mr. McCarthy. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. There might be some light ahead there.

Mr. McCarthy. I made connections with the service bureau here. I belong to the United States Engineer Post of the Legion here. I have made connections through there and they are trying to get my medical record out from the W. P. A. and the S. R. A. and after they get that, why then they can speedily take my case up with the authorities at Sawtelle and from then on they will continue taking the case as it stands.

Mr. Sparkman. I have no questions.

The Chairman. Thank you very much, Mr. McCarthy. If we can help you out at any time, you just write us.

(Witness excused.)

The Chairman. Dr. Stewart.

TESTIMONY OF DR. WENDY STEWART, COUNCIL OF SOCIAL AGENCIES OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. Sparkman. What is your name?

Dr. Stewart. Dr. Wendy Stewart. I am appearing in connection with the report from the legislative committee, division of family welfare, Council of Social Agencies of Los Angeles.

Mr. Sparkman. Dr. Stewart, we understand that you are representing a group of private organizations comprising the Council of Social Agencies of Los Angeles. I wonder if you would tell us something about the functions of your organization.

RELIEF TO MIGRANTS BY PRIVATE AGENCIES

Dr. Stewart. Well, I might say this: That the Council of Social Agencies includes representation from both the public and private agencies, but that we have the most problems, perhaps, as to what the private agency can do in order to fill in the gaps that the public agencies cannot take care of.

As has been brought out in the evidence before you already, there are many situations concerning the migrant where, under the law, the public agency is not enabled to take care of persons who need assistance, and that type of case necessarily applies to a private agency in the hope that something can be done.

I might say that my personal interest in the migrant problem, and knowledge of it, goes back now some 7 years, to 1934, at which time, as you know, there were available Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds. We had committees that were committees of citizens to consider how the funds should be disbursed and what cases should receive aid, and I was a member of one of those committees at that time.

Subsequently I continued my interest in the migrant problem, largely through activities with the various committees of the Council of Social Agencies, I might say particularly with one committee that we had, to take into consideration the problem as it relates to the transient, and then subsequent to that I have been acting with a committee on social legislation which, of course, as part of its problem, has to take into consideration legislation that affects the transient.

The report that has been submitted gives statistics, I think, that indicate that there are approximately 1,000 at least—and probably a good deal more than that—1,000 cases a month in this locality that cannot be dealt with under the present existing laws by public assistance.

Mr. Sparkman. Is that caused by the residence requirements?

Dr. Stewart. That is caused primarily by the residence requirements and the difficulties that there have been with legislation in applying it to these individuals.

Mr. Sparkman. Now let me ask you this: Suppose that a person can't get public assistance and applies to some private agency and obtains private assistance, does not that stand as an obstacle toward that person getting public assistance later? In other words, under requirements that they must have resided here so long without any assistance from these private or public agencies?

Dr. Stewart. Without any assistance from anyone other than a legally responsible relative.

Mr. Sparkman. What are some of these private agencies, just in order that I might have some idea?

Dr. Stewart. Well, there are quite a number, of course, such as the Travelers Aid Society, the Salvation Army, the Midnight Mission, and there are a large number of them whose names I wouldn't be able to recall just at this moment. There are a number to whom these applications for assistance are made, and, of course, primarily, the private agency is designed to give assistance to the people other than financial aid. In other words, the idea of giving financial aid by a private agency is really only incidental to a social case work approach to the problem. They don't have such finances that they can take a family the same way that a public budget could, and supply relief to that family over a sustained period of time. They just give temporary aid to assist a family over an emergency situation or something of that kind and they are not designed in any way by their financing to replace the public agency, all of which comes back once more, of course, to the problem of residence laws.

Mr. Sparkman. Are these budgets of the private agencies raised through subscription or the community chest or what?

Dr. Stewart. There are two groups of private agencies; those which do have membership in the community chest here which means that they are financed by a general drive where the general public contributes to a general fund, which is then allocated to give the agencies their proportion, and then there are also certain private agencies which do not have any subscription or any membership in the community chest and who solicit their funds direct from the members of the public, but in no instance is the budget enough to deal with the cases which are not covered, under present legislation, by the public.

Mr. Sparkman. Do these private agencies have any residence requirements at all?

Dr. Stewart. As far as a private agency is concerned, the private agency is free to take care of whatever it considers a suitable case.

Mr. Sparkman. I understand the principal distinction is this: That the public agency is looking primarily to administering to the needs of the person, the physical needs, whereas the private agencies regard them as social cases, and the physical needs are incidental thereto. Is that right or not?

Dr. Stewart. I think one might put it this way: A public agency, of course, is bound by the legal standpoint as to the circumstances under which a person can be given financial aid, and if a case comes to the public agencies seeking financial aid, but is not eligible for it under the residence requirements, the public agency, unless they can get it under some emergency clause in the legislation, is powerless to act further with that individual case—that is, they couldn't go outside of the scope of the legislation—whereas a private agency, not being bound by that, is bound essentially by the policy set up by the board of directors, and, therefore, can do as it sees fit, as social case work or giving financial aid where it is deemed desirable.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do the public agencies refer cases to you that they cannot handle?

Dr. STEWART. Public agencies refer cases to the private agencies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When I say "to you" I mean to the private agency.

Dr. STEWART. When you say "referring to me" of course I am not primarily in the social work field, except as being interested in the legal standpoint, and the information I am giving you is more background of the angle of legislation than anything else.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have read your paper, the paper that has been submitted, and there is some reference made in there to a survey by the Council of Social Agencies on nonresidence that was made in 1938. I am asking you, was there a significant number of persons, as a result of that survey, who did not qualify for relief of either public or private agencies?

Dr. STEWART. Well, I think I might say that from the standpoint of public agencies there was a large number of people who did not qualify; from the standpoint of the private agency it wouldn't be quite correct to say they did not qualify. As I have indicated, the private agency is not bound by qualification rules, but I could say that they couldn't possibly be taken in by the existing budgets of the private agencies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What was the type of those people principally?

Dr. STEWART. That I wouldn't know as a matter of personal knowledge.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They weren't destitute?

Dr. STEWART. They were the people for whom nothing could be done by a public agency because of a technical residence problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now take the people who cannot be reached by either. What happens to them?

Dr. STEWART. Well, we haven't, of course, what I would call direct knowledge. It has always been one of our difficulties that people who don't understand the problems have said, in effect, when you have stringent legislation that cuts people off by relief laws, by raising your residence requirements, your problem disappears in that public money does not get paid out.

Now obviously, unless you had some kind of a follow-up as to what happened to these particular families in the way of costing, ultimately, more money through police protection and delinquencies and things of that kind, we don't have any way of knowing what does happen to them, except you can predict generally the type of thing that might happen to them. It is not tangible. It is something that has been the subject matter of factual finding, and is at the present time.

HEALTH PROBLEMS

Mr. Sparkman. What did your survey show as to health problems?

Dr. Stewart. Well, it shows, of course, that in many instances even the people within a given community were hampered by their own legislation in protecting themselves against diseases brought in by the migrant. They would have regulations that would make it impossible to admit to a hospital, in some instances, a migrant individual even who had an infectious disease, and in some cases they couldn't be admitted now in many instances. Of course, that was covered by emergency legislation that said in the case of an emergency you could admit a person to local hospitals, but there were some communities that didn't have that and had the strange policy of not even protecting themselves against the infectious disease of the migrant.

Mr. Sparkman. What part do private agencies play in supplying medical aid to these cases that come to their attention?

Dr. Stewart. I don't believe that I am equipped to answer that again, excepting by referring you back to the information in the written report. That is something which is primarily not of my own knowledge.

Mr. Sparkman. Do you, or the organizations that you represent, have any suggestions or recommendations to make to this committee as to how the problems confronting these nonresidents can be met?

Dr. Stewart. Yes; I think we have. I think it comes back, of course, to saying that presumably from the facts that have been laid before you it is apparent that the problem is of sufficient magnitude to warrant something being done about it.

The next question, as to what should be done, comes down to recognizing that probably the problem has two parts, the one angle of what can be done by legislation and the other the necessity—in order to get the proper legislation and have it carried out, by way of public opinion—of studied knowledge as to what the facts actually are.

Mr. Sparkman. Then, of course, of big concern to this committee is the further question, with reference to legislation, as to what part of it is the obligation of the Federal Government and what part should be borne by the State and local governments.

SUGGESTED REVISIONS OF SETTLEMENT LAWS

Dr. Stewart. Well, I think we come back there, of course, to the observations which have already been made here, about the so-called problem of uniform settlement laws, and we at once come up, of course, against the fact that Congress is only empowered to act by a grant of power and can't make a uniform settlement law, and can only do as has been done in other Federal social security phases, and that is make an inducement to the States—offer some kind of aid—the Federal Government offering, as an inducement, either 100 percent or a certain percentage of the amount that would be spent as aid, provided that the State comply with certain requirements which, of course, does not give you a uniform settlement law but will give you a minimum which the States must meet.

The Chairman. Right there, Doctor, if I can interrupt you: The Congress of the United States cannot say to California, and the other

States, "You make a 1-year residence law, or a 5-year residence law." They have no jurisdiction to do that. But when they give these grants and aids to the State, jurisdiction follows the dollar and they can say under what conditions that grant will be made and therefore taking care of the residence law, can they?

Dr. STEWART. Yes; they can.

The CHAIRMAN. Just like the social security?

Dr. STEWART. Exactly. Now I think it is quite important to add several things there that should be brought out, and that the State should be required to comply with, and I think these things are actual items that have come out from practical experience here and in other places.

That is, of course, first, there should be a limit as to the length of time that should be required for so-called legal settlement in the individual States; secondly, that in taking into account the period of self-support that would be necessary it is wise, I think, to recognize that a person who has a reasonable claim on some kind of relief might not have been self-supporting, say, for the entire 2-year period. It may have been, say, for 20 months out of the 2 years, or something of that nature, and it is not very fair, it seems to me, to penalize the person who may have been out of work for a month and got some work at the end of the time.

Another thing I think that has to be taken into consideration rather definitely is that angle of the situation where the residence is dependent upon the situation of the person moving from the place where he has had residence moving to a place where a residence has not been gained, and whose residence has been lost in another State, by providing it will not be lost in one place and gained in another. I think the final point which is of importance—I don't think it has been stressed as much as it should be from the standpoint of family welfare—has been putting something into that legislation from the standpoint of the person whose residence is dependent on that of somebody else.

Now, there are two phases of that. One, of course, is the problem that we have had come up repeatedly, where a married woman's residence is legally supposed to be that of her husband. We had an interesting California case of a girl born here; when she was 25 she was married and the man deserted her the next day and she thereby became a transient unable to have relief, because of a legal technicality.

The other important phase, of course, in many instances is where the law—and I think this is a most important feature—makes the residence of a minor child the residence of the father. That works a great many hardships in the instance where a court order has given custody to the mother. There, in many instances, you have a strange situation. If the mother keeps the child with her she thereby makes the child ineligible to receive any kind of assistance. If, on the other hand, the only way of getting assistance is by giving up her child—the custody of the child—she sends the child to the father, that situation gives us things which don't seem to work out very well. It seems to me that those items, at least, should be included in the particular things that the States should have to meet in order to be eligible to whatever aid Congress would offer by way of Federal assistance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is a little aside from your testimony but, of course, the very things you have mentioned assume that the Federal

The photographs on this and the following pages relate to testimony taken on the Pacific coast, at San Francisco and Los Angeles and were furnished by photographers for the Forest Service and the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture and accepted for the record by the committee.

Reference is made to testimony in Parts 6 and 7 of these Hearings.



This camp is occupied by the same families the year round, on and off relief. Photo taken in April 1940, near Shafter, Calif.

Meeting of the camp council, the governing body of the migratory labor camp near Farmersville, Calif.

Meeting of the Mother's Club in Arven migratory labor camp in November 1938.



The first family to locate in the Westley migratory labor camp in California, in 1939. They are from Oklahoma.



Nurse of the Agricultural Workers' Health and Medical Association clinic at Farmersville, Calif. dressing the injured arm of migrant boy. May 1939.



Rest time in school for migratory children at Shafter camp, Calif. 1939.



Families of refugees from the "Dust Bowl," camped near Holtsville, Calif



Kern County camp at Shafter, now occupied largely by families on relief, who abandoned "following the crops" and are trying to establish a semipermanent home. Photo made in April 1940.

Scene on the All-American Canal, near Coachella, Calif., taken in May 1938. See next page.



Looking upstream at the All-American Canal, near Araz, Calif. Southern Pacific Railroad, U. S. Highway 80, and railroad bridges may be seen. February 1939.



Land made ready for irrigation near Calexico, Calif. June 1939.

Irrigation canal near Yuma. Desert land on the near side of canal, irrigated field beyond.

2922-H

Government is going to make some kind of a grant to the State in connection with this work. I am just curious to know what your thought is as to how those grants should be made, whether on the basis of matching by the State or on a basis of need regardless of financial ability to match it.

Dr. STEWART. I am wondering whether the answer to that question wouldn't be a matter of balancing out what might be the ideal against what I call political expediency. In other words, I don't think that there is any particular point in working for the ideal legislation if you don't think it will be acceptable to the representatives of a sufficient number of the States. If you want to get an improvement in your legislation, you would have to see how far toward the ideal you can go and still have a sufficient number of representatives of the different States agreeable so they would vote for this legislation. You, being in Congress, would know the answer to that a great deal better than I would.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, you agree with me that as a matter of right you should be on a basis of need rather than on the ability to match?

Dr. STEWART. I am not absolutely certain how far I would be quite sure of that without examining into a number of factors. I do rely, of course—and I think this is a fair statement to make—on the fact that some of the States are very hard hit by the number of transients who go to them. On the other hand, possibly they should expect to support a certain amount of that load themselves. In other words, I don't follow the theory at all that a State should come to Congress asking for everything and giving nothing. I don't see how the States can expect the other States to be willing to fall in line with a legislation of that type.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, of course, in framing the question I didn't have in mind simply the relief to be given to the migrant problem, but I was thinking of the whole scope of the Federal assistance to the States in caring for these problems that we do recognize as national.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Doctor.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will take a short recess.

(At this point a short recess was taken, after which proceedings were resumed as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, please.

Rev. Clarence Wagner, please.

TESTIMONY OF THE REV. CLARENCE WAGNER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the Rev. Clarence Wagner?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your address?

Mr. WAGNER. Los Angeles; 7100 Wilson Avenue.

The CHAIRMAN. I have read your statement, Mr. Wagner, and I don't know whether it is a compliment to me or to you, but it seems to me that we speak each other's language in regard to this migrant problem. Your statement will be inserted in the record at this point, and then we should like to ask you some questions.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY THE REV. CLARENCE WAGNER, PASTOR, FLORENCE AVENUE METHODIST CHURCH, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AND CHAIRMAN MINISTERIAL MIGRANTS COMMITTEE.

The Effect of Interstate Migration on California Community Life

Following the drought of 1935 in the Dust Bowl, hundreds of thousands of destitute small farmers and tenant farmers were faced with the alternative of starvation or migration. Hundreds of thousands of them chose migration and moved west.

The Migrants Cooperating Council[1] support the right of these men and women to move from one State to another in search of a better life. We believe that this is in the finest tradition of a free America.

Inevitably, however, certain social and economic problems have arisen as a result of this giant migration. These problems have followed the trail of migratory workers as they moved westward. They exist at the end of this trail in California.

It is the function of the Migrants Cooperating Council and each of its members to prevent, alleviate, or remedy these social and economic problems, each in the manner it feels most effective. They have combined to present here a common statement of conditions as they see them and a common program for improving these conditions.

Migration.—Perhaps the most fundamental problem of the migratory worker is the wide discrepancy between the labor supply and the labor market. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that 200,000 laborers are required to harvest California's crops at peak season. There are no exact statistics available on the number of Dust Bowl refugees who have come to California since 1935. Estimates vary from 350,000 to half a million. The problem of unemployment is therefore acute.

In view of this, we must ask why these people left their homelands to look for a doubtful livelihood in California. We cannot, of course, overlook the strong appeal of California's fertile soil and highly advertised climate. But these cannot be considered fundamental reasons for the exodus of 1935 to 1940. California's climate and soil existed with the same appeal before those years but few of the Midwest farmers tore their deep roots out of their native soil to move west.

The real answer to this question is twofold. These people had no choice. Relief in Oklahoma, for example, runs under $4 per month for a family. It is only slightly higher in Arkansas. Faced with a living standard such as this, even the ties of heritage cannot hold a people to their homes. The reason they come to California is of course, in part, that California seems to offer a higher living standard.[2] More important, however, was the promise of employment advertised through handbills put out by labor contractors telling of thousands of jobs available.[3]

Therefore, it is our conviction that a program of relief should be undertaken by the Federal Government which will stabilize relief standards in the various States. Such a program would involve an extension of existing agencies such as the Farm Security Administration and an equitable minimum relief standard for all States.

Such a program would discourage mass migration in the only legitimate way; through making it possible to remain at home.

With regard to the exaggerated promise of employment, we feel that the Federal Employment Service, in collaboration with State employment agencies, should make available all information as regards labor requirements in given areas; this information to include an assured wage.

---

[1] Migrants Cooperating Council comprised of: Committee to Aid Agricultural Workers, represented by Patricia Killoran; Methodist Men, Mr. L. E. Martin; Migrant Committee of the United Church Women, Mrs. C. C. Douglas; Fellowship of Reconciliation, Harold Hull; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Mrs. Alice Gilbert; Friends Service and Epworth League, Rev. Herman Beimfohr and John Way; president of Migrants Cooperating Council, Dwight Hughes.

[2] Any comparison of relief standards has to be made in terms of wealth. California contains approximately 5 percent of the population of the United States. California's expenditure for all types of social welfare and relief in January and February of 1939 was 6.5 percent of the national total. U. S. Department of Commerce estimated that California received 7.3 percent of the national wealth. Because there is a greater per capita distribution of wealth in California it necessarily follows that relief standards can and should be higher in California than for a State with a lower per capita distribution of wealth (Carey McWilliams, Hollywood Citizen News, January 1940).

[3] Copies of these handbills may be found in the Farm Security Administration offices in San Francisco, Calif.

Practically, this could be accomplished through the appointment of one representative of the Federal Employment Service to operate in each State in conjunction with the State employment service and with the Federal operators in other States.

Immediate relief.—It has become almost axiomatic that one-third of our Nation or more is ill-housed, ill-clothed and ill-fed. Of this third, no other group is more destitute than the migrant agricultural workers. Dr. Dickie, director of the California State Department of Public Health, said "Of first importance is the provision of adequate food for these migratory families." The lack of food, the lack of adequate housing, the lack of shoes in the winter—these things mean sickness.

Both as citizens of California and members of committees to bring relief to these people, we contend that the problem of health among the migratory families is a vital one to the State and Federal Governments.

The average wage of the migrant family falls below $300 per year. Almost half of this is required in the upkeep of their automobile, the most essential possession. These soil farmers must buy their food in stores, since there is no land available for them. Malnutrition is inevitable. Lack of adequate medical care is inevitable. Chronic illnesses and disease accumulate until they become a serious menace, not only to the migratory population as a whole but to the entire community. These people are often herded into crowded, unsanitary camps, and the spread of disease is rapid and difficult to control. Dr. Omar Mills, speaking at the 1938 convention of the California League of Municipalities, stated:

"Particular types of health problems develop out of the mobility, the living and sanitary conditions, and the economic status of this group. Among these are the easy and rapid spread of communicable diseases; the prevalence of sickness caused by unsanitary living conditions; the high incidence of diseases traceable to malnutrition; and a general neglect of health due to poverty and to ineligibility for State and county aid."

"Disease," writes Victor Jones in Transients and Migrants [4] "is no respecter of county boundary lines, especially when its carriers cross them several times a year." Smallpox, typhoid, tuberculosis are all common to the migrant workers. In 1938 smallpox was carried from the San Joaquin Valley to the Imperial Valley by agricultural workers, and typhoid was carried back from Imperial to Kern County. In 1936 approximately 90 percent of the reported cases of typhoid fever in California occurred among rural agricultural workers.[5]

Therefore, we believe that the Farm Security Administration housing projects should be extended immediately. This should include the establishment of community camps in areas where short-season crops prevail and an extension of the Farm Security mobile units. Along with this, the health units should be extended along the lines of the Farm Security Administration's low-cost medical program.

In counties which have 3-year residence requirements for relief, the Federal and State Government must see that adequate health protection is offered transients until they are eligible for county aid.

Collective bargaining.—American crops must be harvested. We must rely on human hands to do this harvesting. These problems will exist in a greater or lesser degree unsolved until the people who do the harvesting receive a living wage for their work. Therefore we support them in their efforts to obtain a better life through the organization into a union of their own choosing for the purpose of collective bargaining with their employers. Consequently, we urge the extension of all social gains made by urban workers to the workers of rural areas, such as the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, Social Security, unemployment insurance, etc.

Long-range program.—Agricultural employment offered by California is seasonal in nature, leaving long periods during which the work available cannot possibly take care of any but a negligible amount of migrant workers. This is indicated by the tremendous increase in State relief agency case loads which is noted to begin in September, continuing through until spring.

Coupled with this is the fact that there are more migrant families in California than can possibly be maintained by California crops, even in peak season.

---

[4] Published by the Bureau of Public Administration, University of California.

[5] Weekly Bulletin, California State Department of Health, p. 139.

Therefore, it is our conviction that no solution of this problem can possibly be envisaged which does not contain a program with a view toward resettling these families; toward stabilizing their incomes and their general contribution to the communities as a whole. We strongly urge that such a program be presented, including an extension of large-scale cooperative farms on productive lands, such as the Salt River and Visalia projects. In addition, the Federal Government should expand the subsistence farm program of the Farm Security Administration with a view to settling families on land from which they may draw enough by their own efforts to sustain themselves between periods of employment.

Along with such a program, we feel that an extension and a bringing into large-scale operation of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act to enable the migrant workers to work and purchase land under reasonable rates of interest is highly advisable.

The great majority of California's migratory workers are completely without voting rights. This is due to the transient nature of their work, along with the extremely low standard of wages prevailing in agriculture, which make it impossible for the migrants to remain in a county for the 3-month period required to attain voting privileges.

Agriculture is the main industry of California. By numerical count, the migratory agricultural worker makes up the largest group employed in the maintenance of that industry. That this group should have no voice in the democratic processes of the State and Federal Government we consider as representing a very real danger to the democracy of our State and Nation as a whole. Therefore, we feel that it is incumbent upon the Federal Government, interested in the preservation of democracy, to make available through the suggested extension of their housing, medical and relief program, conditions under which these migratory workers can sustain themselves until they are legally entitled to voting privileges and an equitable voice in government.

TESTIMONY OF THE REV. CLARENCE WAGNER—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we start out this way: The causes of this migration from State to State are varied and they are many and therefore, there is no single solution, but there will be several possible approaches to at least bettering the condition we are in now regarding the migrant problem. That is true, isn't it?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And also, Mr. Wagner, there is a school of thought in California—and we met it in different sections of the United States—who endeavor to dismiss this critical problem by saying, "Why don't they stay home?" and I note from your paper that you express the point that there comes a time when they cannot stay home. Is that true?

Mr. WAGNER. That has been our experience; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that there are different causes, the worn-out soil, mechanization, drought, and different causes where the people will move rather than starve sitting down or standing still?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I would like to have you, Mr. Wagner, say anything you have to say about it, any possible recommendation because, speaking for myself only, I think you know what you are talking about. Tell me how this organization of yours sprung into existence and, briefly, what it has been doing.

WORK OF CHURCH GROUPS AMONG MIGRANTS

Mr. WAGNER. Well, for the past 8 years I have been living in the San Joaquin Valley, in Fresno and Delano. Those have been rather hot spots so far as migration is concerned. I have attempted to aline myself with these different groups mentioned on the sheet, and see if there wouldn't be some way whereby we might function rather effectively as a minority protest group.

Especially with the Friends and the Epworth League we have tried to organize groups so that we might get money and carry on a little rehabilitation work among these camps.

Probably one of the outstanding efforts was at Shafter where we built a recreation camp and have a college crew there, donating their time and paying $75 for the privilege of working through the summer and studying social conditions, talking at Rotary Clubs, chambers of commerce—where they are allowed to get in—and trying to interpret, just as much as possible, the attitude of the migrant and their willingness to work, their good will, their honesty, and trying to show, Chairman Tolan, that their morale just left them entirely and they really needed a lot of help.

Then these organizations have further attempted to try to work along with some kind of an industrial organization, something parallel to our industrial organizations. I have always felt that the working man hasn't any opportunity to express himself in agriculture. He does not have the educational background. He does not quite know how to approach the problem of organization. They are farmers and they are interested in farming, and farmers are notoriously hard to organize. A lot of these men have been farmers and when they come together and face an organized industrial group and they are told that they have to work for a certain wage that they have had nothing to say about, they don't know anything better than to accept it. There is no voice to represent them.

So these groups have tried to encourage the organization of such groups that they might bargain collectively, but, I think, without very much success. My experience in the valley has been that the controlling agencies in the community, the ones who have the land, the businessmen, are absolutely against the organization of farm labor and intimidate farm labor. They have in their control the State patrol bodies, the motor-vehicle force; they have the local sheriffs of the counties strongly back of them. I have numerous clippings here that show there would be a group of a dozen automobiles filled with men, probably with the intention of striking and about to cross a county line, and they would be just forced, forcibly, to turn back into the county from whence they came. There is a great deal of that that goes on and it is not hard to intimidate them because they feel the county officers are against them; the motor-vehicle officers are against them; the chambers of commerce and other organizations are against them; and that it is a pretty hopeless struggle.

Sometimes I wonder at their passive nature, that they don't turn to radical organizations a whole lot more than they do, lacking leadership that ought to come out of the business and social life of the communities in which they live.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you find that out? You have mixed with these destitute citizens coming from other States, haven't you?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find them mostly American citizens?

Mr. WAGNER. I would put them up against any man in our own community—any of the businessmen. They speak a little brogue that is a little different from ours, but they love their children and they want to have them get an education. When they are sick they feel it like anybody else, and they need a lot of sympathy and a lot of help. Instead of that they are put into Government camps—which are a vast improvement over the normal camps that we find in an individual farm—but, after all, it is just a place, and if it rains the rain comes in and you see the canvas flapping in the breeze. If they go into better rehabilitation homes, there they have cement floors and it is not altogether too nice, even of the best, and all of that just drives down the morale of the people until they don't know where to turn. Then every once in a while they will organize a protest, and if one will stand in on one of those meetings you will realize that they are rather hopeless. They say, "What shall we do?"

I could tell you some of the work that we are trying to do toward helping the migrant working in the field from a Christian point of view, if you would like to know about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we would like to have that.

Mr. WAGNER. An experiment was started just about a year ago now in taking a young man who is a college graduate and who has had 3 years' further graduate work in Northwestern University and putting him in a camp near Farmersville. He gathers together a group of young people from the churches and a group of young people from the migrant settlement and gets them in a home, which we have rented for him, and allows them to have their folk games and their discussion groups on Saturday night and over Sunday, and then dismisses them again. His reaction to it all is that when they don't know each other as migrants and as established citizens in a community, that their ideals, their aims, and their dreams are just parallel and that there is a fine fellowship.

It is a long program but our hopes are that we can lead these young people into a feeling that they are a part of the community life; that we are interested in them and want to work with them and believe they are as good as any of our own young people. They respond to that kind of treatment in a fine way.

The CHAIRMAN. You see under the conditions that you are not only a citizen of California but you are a citizen of the other 47 States; is that true?

Mr. WAGNER. I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. But it does not work out practically, sometimes, going from State to State, does it? They run up against barriers, don't they?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you readily see, Mr. Wagner, that Federal interest in this problem is necessary for the reason that there may come a time—and it probably has arrived now—where a single State cannot, from a tax standpoint and from an educational and health standpoint, absorb what comes in there and pack the load. Isn't that true?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes. We find that is true, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you have had 850,000 people come here in the last 5 years. The conservative figures are that 395,000 of those are destitute interstate migrant citizens. If you had a disaster in Pennsylvania, by which the farms were uprooted and destroyed and the people couldn't live and they had to migrate to Ohio, 395,000 at one time, or in 2 or 3 weeks, the Congress of the United States would convene in a special session to take care of that, wouldn't they?

Mr. WAGNER. I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. But here, over a period of 5 years, imperceptibly it has gone along on a hit-and-miss proposition; isn't that right?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that it is very commendable, your interest in this, because you are convinced, aren't you, Mr. Wagner, that migration can never be stopped in the United States?

Mr. WAGNER. Well, I hope it can be handled in such a way that the intensive migration will cease and these men can find places on farms, either cooperative farms or collective farms, in one way or another, so that they can become more of a part of the community than they are at the present time. They are shoved off on the edge and they don't get into our school boards; they don't join our chambers of commerce or our service clubs, and they are just not represented. Their voice is as one crying in the wilderness.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you given any thought to the settlement idea based upon a certain plan?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes. I think that is one of the great programs that ought to be pushed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not the whole situation, but it is an approach?

Mr. WAGNER. I am convinced that it is; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And what do you think about the cooperative idea of farms?

Mr. WAGNER. I think that that is one of the great outstanding accomplishments of the present administration. I am thinking of one at Visalia.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we saw that yesterday.

Mr. WAGNER. That was outstanding. I only wish there were many more of those. I do wish our businessmen could catch a vision of that and not throw the whole load on the Government. They would be able to establish things like that themselves, but I think they are scared, and they fight against the laboring man. I don't know what they would have done if the Government hadn't stepped in and given them the aid they have given them. I would hate to leave them to the mercy of agricultural organized businessman. I don't think the individual small farmer would be intolerant—he has a pretty big heart—but some executive comes along and then the farmer signs his name on the dotted line and pays his dollar and becomes part of an organization that he has no control in and no voice in, and yet that organization wields a lot of power in these rural communities. It is not right but it is hard to protest against.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, Mr. Wagner, we have got to get it in our heads, don't we, that these people, by the hundreds of thousands, are going from State to State and are forced out of their homes and their farms, and that they are not just people but that they are our own American citizens, don't we?

Mr. WAGNER. Well, everyone I have encountered is just fine, like these men that we have been listening to here today. They are all right.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard that man, did you, with the eight children and a smile on his face?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He looks like he can take an awful beating.

Mr. WAGNER. He probably has already.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything, Congressman Sparkman?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice that you said you were sometimes surprised that these people in these camps and these migrants, generally, didn't give way more than they do toward radical thinking and learning. Have you found very much radicalism among them?

Mr. WAGNER. Very, very little. They will blow off individually, but when it comes to being against the Government, they are not. It is like when we were in the Army, we did a lot of beefing about conditions, but if somebody really began to undermine, we would stand right up for what we believed in, and those migrants are the same way. They are fundamentally Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no misgivings as to their loyalty and patriotism?

Mr. WAGNER. I think it is too bad that the radical element is given the headlines and the stable element is not given an opportunity to express itself.

The CHAIRMAN. You said about the only difference was the brogue that they had. What do you mean by that?

Mr. WAGNER. Well, "You all."

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say to you, Mr. Wagner, that this is a very strange committee. It is the first committee in the history of Congress that is dedicating its work just to this one problem. We started in in New York to show that it was not a California problem alone, and then we went to Alabama, Illinois, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, and so forth. It is simply a question of arousing the Nation's attention to it because the American heart is all right. Now we hope to not only arouse the attention but we hope, upon the facts that we have obtained here, to propose some remedial legislation. We are a fact-finding body, and in another way we are strange. We have never—probably for the first time in the history of Congress—issued a subpena. That is, no witness has been served by any officer to appear at any one of our committee meetings. Again that shows the heart of the American people. They want to help out on this and they will if we can just arouse them to the proposition. It has been a hit-and-miss proposition. They watch the coal and iron and steel go across State lines and it is protected religiously, but nothing is done about the human in interstate commerce. We let them take care of themselves, isn't that true?

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. WAGNER. I think so. I think there ought to be a place for this Wagner Labor Relations Act. I am no relation to him as far as I know—I might wish that I were—but I certainly wish that there were some way that that might be extended to take in agriculture, and then there would be an unemployment insurance that would reach out and touch these people, too. They need it just as much as people around here in the city.

The Chairman. Well, have you any other suggestions that you care to make, or any other word that you want to tell us? We have your full statement here, you know.

Mr. Wagner. Just that I am in fullest sympathy with these people. I have seen them living in abject misery, and they still do; families of five and six and seven in a room. I have buried babies that have been born dead because of the malnutrition of their mothers. I have seen the children with diseases in Kern County and it pretty well extends over all the country—these infectious diseases that break out. I have seen women that ought to be young looking at 40 looking like they were about 60 already. I have seen children shunted out of the schools at noon time and put in a big cotton field—children 5 and 6 years of age—dragging a sack between their legs, and something ought to be done about that whole proposition. It isn't American and it is not fair to these people who come out here and who have to work and don't have any way of making their protest. Then, once in a while, some group will try to organize them but it is hounded out of existence by another group that is highly organized. My sympathy is decidedly with the agricultural worker.

The Chairman. Thank you very much. That was a very fine contribution.

(Witness excused.)

The Chairman. Is Mr. Fishburn here? (No response).

If not, we will call Mr. Arthur Hallgren.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR HALLGREN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. Sparkman. This is Mr. Arthur Hallgren?

Mr. Hallgren. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sparkman. H-a-l-l-g-r-e-n?

Mr. Hallgren. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. You live at 431 West Ninety-first Place, Los Angeles?

Mr. Hallgren. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. How old are you?

Mr. Hallgren. 22.

Mr. Sparkman. Are you married?

Mr. Hallgren. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. How old is your wife?

Mr. Hallgren. 20.

Mr. Sparkman. Have you any children?

Mr. Hallgren. No.

Mr. Sparkman. How long have you been married?

Mr. Hallgren. Since January 3, 1940.

Mr. Sparkman. Where were you born?

Mr. Hallgren. In Mora, Minn.

Mr. Sparkman. Well, did you live in Minnesota most of your life?

Mr. Hallgren. Yes.

Mr. Sparkman. Where? At Mora?

Mr. Hallgren. No; Duluth, Minn.

Mr. Sparkman. Did you—how far did you go in school?

Mr. Hallgren. I graduated from high school.

Mr. Sparkman. Where?

Mr. HALLGREN. Duluth, Minn.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When?

Mr. HALLGREN. 1938.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did you get any work following that?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes. I worked at a body shop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. An automobile body shop?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How long did you continue that work?

Mr. HALLGREN. I worked there until I left there in June.

Mr. SPARKMAN. June when?

Mr. HALLGREN. 1940.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You just left there in June of this year?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You came directly to Los Angeles?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes. I came here June 7.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How did you happen to come to California?

Mr. HALLGREN. Well, I had some friends up there in Duluth and they left there 4 months before I left, and they got work out at an aircraft factory, North American, and so they wrote back and said that there was work out here. But they didn't say that there was 100 men to every job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, did they have any trouble finding work?

Mr. HALLGREN. No. They got work right away.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Were they skilled workmen?

Mr. HALLGREN. No; just one of them attended school at Duluth. He attended a trade school.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A vocational school?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Trade school?

Mr. HALLGREN. Just a high-school trade course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, had the others had any training in a trade?

Mr. HALLGREN. None of the others had gone through high school.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But all of them—how many of them were there?

Mr. HALLGREN. There were four.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And all of them got work right away?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes. One of the boys didn't get work right away—he didn't get work for about 2 months—finally he got work in a machine shop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Have you tried to get work?

Mr. HALLGREN. I am working out at North American.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You are now working?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes. I got in there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When?

Mr. HALLGREN. The day before yesterday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What are you doing?

Mr. HALLGREN. I am working in a tin shop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A machine shop?

Mr. HALLGREN. No. A tin shop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A tin shop? What have you been doing since getting here in June?

Mr. HALLGREN. The only thing I did here was work for a contractor, mixing cement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much of that work did you do?

Mr. HALLGREN. I only worked for them 2 weeks and I had to quit because he didn't pay.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, did you get any other work?

Mr. HALLGREN. Since then?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HALLGREN. Nothing except this job at North American.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You say there are about 100 persons to every job?

Mr. HALLGREN. There is all of that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before coming out here did you hear much talk about it out here?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. About coming out this way?

Mr. HALLGREN. They all talked about all these different Government contracts, and all the airplane industries, I guess. And of all the shipbuilding that they are getting up in San Francisco.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That has served as a kind of a suction to pull the boys away, is that it, and have them come out here seeking employment?

Mr. HALLGREN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is only natural to go where you think there might be something doing?

Mr. HALLGREN. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do you know of many people around here that are in the same shape that you have been in until the day before yesterday?

Mr. HALLGREN. There is a lot of them, all right. I made the rounds of all the airplane factories and put in my application at all of them. On every morning there would be a different bunch of men there, and every morning there would be anyway two or three hundred.

Mr. SPARKMAN. You might have said a minute ago what it was, but what is the nature of your work with the aircraft company?

Mr. HALLGREN. Sheet metal work; in a tin shop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, are you a skilled tin worker, a tinsmith?

Mr. HALLGREN. Well, I got in the airplane factory because I suppose they figured I was skilled at that, but I worked in a body business building house trailers and it is nothing like the airplane business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it did involve work with tin?

Mr. HALLGREN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, son.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Milhorn.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD MILHORN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. You are Edward Milhorn?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And where do you live now?

Mr. MILHORN. I live in Highland Park, on Monterey Road, Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you born?

Mr. MILHORN. Stonefort, Ill.

The CHAIRMAN. And how old are you?

Mr. MILHORN. I am 46.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you living on a farm there?

Mr. MILHORN. No, sir. My father was a railroad man. That is a small railroad terminal.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, how old were you when you left there?

Mr. MILHORN. I left there when I was about 13. I left there in about 1907.

The CHAIRMAN. Your father and mother were living there when you left?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you leave?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, my father lost his position on the railroad and he came south to Missouri. He got employment with the St. L. & S. F.

The CHAIRMAN. Did your mother go with him?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes; we all went there. He went ahead and then sent for us. We came down there about a month after he got work.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you live there?

Mr. MILHORN. I lived there until I joined the Army in 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you see service?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you over?

Mr. MILHORN. Twenty-three months altogether. My outfit was overseas about 11 months.

The CHAIRMAN. And then when you came back where did you go?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, I came back to Memphis, Tenn.

The CHAIRMAN. Right across the line?

Mr. MILHORN. They join.

The CHAIRMAN. And how old were you then?

Mr. MILHORN. I guess I was about 24; something like that, 24 or 25.

The CHAIRMAN. And what did you do there?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, I had been railroading and I went back to railroading.

The CHAIRMAN. And how long did you railroad at that place?

Mr. MILHORN. I railroaded until '29. I got a personal injury that put me on the shelf so far as the railroad was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. And where did you go then?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, I went up into Kentucky in 1930. They paid us soldiers the soldiers' bonus, or part of it, and I took what I had and I went up in Kentucky and bought myself a little farm up there.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you married then?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. By the way, how many children have you now?

Mr. MILHORN. I have seven.

The CHAIRMAN. Only seven?

Mr. MILHORN. Just seven—that is, when I left home there were seven.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not looking for a surprise, are you?

Mr. MILHORN. You can never tell. This world is full of them. It is not a surprise to me any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what kind of a farm was it?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, it was a little stock farm. The land had been farmed pretty extensively and it was just about worn out and I got it at a bargain.

The Chairman. What did you pay for it?

Mr. Milhorn. I think I gave about $500 for 25 acres. The buildings were pretty well dilapidated and I spent what other money I had in building another building or so on it and improving the buildings. I had taken an option on 20 acres that was joining. I figured on building the farm up and making pasture land out of that more than anything else, and try to raise stock. I was drawing a small compensation from the Government then.

The Chairman. How much a month?

Mr. Milhorn. I was rated 50 percent partial permanent disability and I was drawing at that time $18 a month. That is a non-service-connected disability.

The Chairman. Well, how did you get along with the farm there?

Mr. Milhorn. I got along pretty well.

The Chairman. How long did you live there?

Mr. Milhorn. I lived there—I went up in there in '30, I believe it was, and I stayed until 1933.

The Chairman. And then what did you do? Did you sell the farm?

Mr. Milhorn. Yes; I had to sell it. That is when they passed the Economy Act, if you remember, and they cut us out of our disability allowance, and I hadn't made very big preparations as far as raising feed was concerned. I was depending on that disability pay mostly for my feed through the winter. I had my stock and things. And, incidentally, eggs went down to 6 cents a dozen and everything else in proportion. I just didn't think I could make it. Of course, if I had known then what I know now—Mr. Roosevelt didn't take me into his confidence and I didn't know there was going to be any help of any sort for the farmer—I picked up and sold out and left there and came to town where I thought maybe I might get work.

The Chairman. How much money did you have when you left the farm?

Mr. Milhorn. I didn't have very much. I owed for the lumber and the improvements I put on the place. It was a forced sale and probably, as you know, a forced sale doesn't bring very much.

The Chairman. No; never. What did you do when you came to town?

Mr. Milhorn. I came back there and I went over in Arkansas. My wife had some people over there. I went over into Arkansas and went to work for the Chicago Mill Lumber Co. over there. I worked for them until they got out their timber supply there, and then I went on relief. I worked on the W. P. A. for a while.

The Chairman. How long were you on relief?

Mr. Milhorn. Well, I don't remember just exactly how long I was on there.

The Chairman. And what time did you leave there to come West?

Mr. Milhorn. The first time I came out here was last year. This is my second trip. I came out here in August of '39 and couldn't find any work when I stayed out here.

The Chairman. How did you come out? Did you drive out?

Mr. Milhorn. Yes.

The Chairman. How many children did you have then?

Mr. Milhorn. I had six; six children.

The Chairman. And you drove out? What kind of a car did you have?

Mr. Milhorn. A Lincoln Zephyr.

The Chairman. A late model Lincoln?

Mr. Milhorn. Yes. It was a good car. It was, I think, a '38 model—it was last year's—just a year old.

The Chairman. And where did you land when you first came here?

Mr. Milhorn. I came right into Los Angeles.

The Chairman. And what did you do here?

Mr. Milhorn. Well I delivered this car to the owners. The car didn't belong to me.

The Chairman. It didn't belong to you?

Mr. Milhorn. No, sir.

The Chairman. I thought you were riding a little high.

Mr. Milhorn. I was. I came in style. I delivered the car to the owners and then applied—well, I had a few dollars and I looked around and tried to find some work and I run out of money and I applied for relief, on S. R. A.

They gave me temporary relief and then they paid my transportation for my family and self back there.

The Chairman. You mean the Los Angeles County did?

Mr. Milhorn. The S. R. A., the State.

The Chairman. The State?

Mr. Milhorn. The transient bureau, whatever it is.

The Chairman. They paid the transportation of your wife and your family?

Mr. Milhorn. Yes.

The Chairman. Back to——

Mr. Milhorn (interrupting). Back East.

The Chairman. Back to what place?

Mr. Milhorn. Well, we should have went to Helena, Ark., but I didn't go there. I went to Memphis.

The Chairman. Then you ran into residential troubles there?

Mr. Milhorn. Yes; I have been hop-skipping around ever since; didn't have any residence there and haven't any anywhere now; no residence anywhere now.

The Chairman. You still are an American citizen?

Mr. Milhorn. Yes; I did put in a winter back there. It was just too tough and all.

The Chairman. What did you do, Mr. Milhorn?

Mr. Milhorn. I worked some at a little mill, a little veneer mill. You have got to compete back there with colored labor at 30 cents an hour—that is tops—and they have speeded production up where a man my age cannot compete with the younger man. It is just too tough. I made a resolution that if I could get out of there and get to where the climate was not so hard, that I would do it.

The Chairman. What kind of a house did you live in back there?

Mr. Milhorn. Well, just a frame house; hard to heat.

The Chairman. How much rent did you pay?

Mr. Milhorn. I paid $12 a month. That is more than it was worth.

The Chairman. How much did you earn a month?

Mr. Milhorn. Well, if I got in a full week back there—I believe 42 hours, $12.60, after they deducted the insurance.

The CHAIRMAN. $12.60?

Mr. MILHORN. $12.60 a week, and a family of nine of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Then when did you leave there again to come here?

Mr. MILHORN. I came out here the 1st of August of this year.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you come? By what means?

Mr. MILHORN. I came in a Cadillac eight this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you were moving up all the time?

Mr. MILHORN. Getting better.

The CHAIRMAN. Still belong to somebody else?

Mr. MILHORN. Sure, another man's car. You see, back there, if you can furnish them a little reference, and convince them that you are a pretty good driver, you can get an automobile and drive it out here. You furnish the gas and oil and they furnish the automobile.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, why don't all migrants come out that way?

Mr. MILHORN. They just don't know about it.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do when you got here?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, this time I went to work. I was lucky. I went right to work right off the bat.

The CHAIRMAN. Doing what?

Mr. MILHORN. I got a job driving and helping out here at a van and storage company—well, they have two places—they had a furniture department in connection with it, and between the two I have had pretty regular work ever since I have been out here, up until just a while back when I got a rib broken and I have been off ever since. I went back to go to work the other day and I had lost that job.

The CHAIRMAN. You lost that job?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes; I am out of a job now.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you figure you could get one?

Mr. MILHORN. Well, I think I can. I have some got pretty good prospects. I don't know. Sometimes they don't pan out so good.

The CHAIRMAN. How are the children? Are they all well, they and your wife?

Mr. MILHORN. The children are all well except I have one little fellow that has some sort of a nervous disorder, but that was one of the factors that brought us back out here. When we were out here last year he seemed to get better. I don't know whether it was a different environment or the schools or what it was, but anyway he improved. When we went back there he got worse.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, notwithstanding that, or, I mean, with that ailment of the baby, would you rather live back there than here?

Mr. MILHORN. No, I hadn't. No, sir. Our money will buy more in California than it will back there. I found that out. I was out here 22 years ago and I guess I kind of got bit by the California bug. I don't know what else you would call it. I soldiered out here right after the World War and I liked California.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you have driven through that Dust Bowl area; haven't you?

Mr. MILHORN. Yes; I have driven through all of that area.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think, Mr. Milhorn, that lots of those people simply have to get off of their farms and move, or starve, either one of the two?

Mr. MILHORN. I will tell you. If I had my choice, I would give it all back to the Indians. I couldn't use the most of that country.

The CHAIRMAN. We can't find any Indians to give it back to.

Mr. MILHORN. They wouldn't have it. I don't see anything back through that country that could make a man want to go back to it. You can take that hill land like they have in Tennessee and Alabama and you can reclaim it. If you get a few gullies you can throw in some brush and throw a few grass seeds down and you can stop it, but I don't know what they could do with that country back there in the Middle West. I don't know how they would stop that.

The CHAIRMAN. They lost, during the last 10 years, a million in the Great Plains States, a million people. They can stand that difficult weather and wind just so long.

Mr. MILHORN. I have an idea that is right. It is going to take its toll. You have to have something there to hold it. Any time you take something out of the soil you have got to put something back.

The CHAIRMAN. There was some administrative witness at Lincoln, Nebr., who testified that there were 5,000,000 acres in the Great Plains States where 25 percent of the topsoil was gone.

Mr. MILHORN. I wouldn't doubt that at all. I don't know but what you would find lots of areas where all of it was gone.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Fishburn here? [No response.] Is Mr. Burruss here? [No response.]

At this time, due to the fact that Governor Blood, of Utah, was unavoidably detained, and is unable to be here today, I would like to have incorporated in the record a letter from Governor Blood to Dr. E. J. Rowell.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salt Lake City, September 23, 1940.

DR. E. J. ROWELL,
585 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DR. ROWELL: As arranged in my telephone conversation with Dr. Lamb, I am sending today by air mail six copies of a statement entitled "The Problem of Population Migration in Utah," prepared and sponsored by Mr. Thornton W. Petersen of the State Planning Board of Utah. The intent of placing this statement in your hands is that it may be used as supporting data required in your House investigations of destitute migrants.

An additional study has been made by the Farm Security Administration of the work it has done in Utah in behalf of the low-income farm group.

I hope these two statements will suffice to give the committee helpful information.

It may be impossible for me to be present at the Los Angeles meeting, but after my conversation with Dr. Lamb I am assured that the documents I herein mention will serve the purpose. If, however, you desire further information we shall be glad to supply it.

Very truly yours,

HENRY H. BLOOD, *Governor.*

The CHAIRMAN. I also have a statement presented by Thornton W. Petersen concerning the problem of population migration in Utah, which I at this time would like to incorporate in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

The Problem of Population Migration in Utah

Utah has a twofold problem in population migration. There is the problem involving the human resource loss of a large proportion of its natural increase through migration away from the State. There is the problem presented through migration into the State. The first encompasses a consideration of the economic and social losses sustained through the out-of-State migration of its youth and population of productive ages. The second is of consequence to the State in that the into-State migration is not only insufficient to offset the losses occurring through the outward migration, but that also it is closely related to the State's problems in relief, and to the socio-economic assimilation of the inward migrants.

These two principal problems have been identified and recognized by the entire State. It should be clearly understood, however, that the many ramifications of these problems have not been studied completely. The failure to have made an exhaustive analysis of them is not because of a lack of interest by the people, but essentially because the necessary data for their study are insufficient. Only general trends can be observed. Inferences drawn from these trends are, of course, to be taken only as approximations. The need for preparation of a thoroughly exhaustive statistical basis for the study of these problems is obvious. Nevertheless, this paper ventures to place tentative interpretations upon these trends if for no other purpose than to encourage the movement taking place to more fully understand these probelms and the fundamentals in their solution.

While the population of Utah has increased throughout each decade, since first settlement of the State, the rate of increase during each successive period has declined. During the period between 1910 and 1940, the population curve as seen in the following chart was leveling off to smaller proportional gains.

The natural increase in the State's population shows an increase of 5.3 percent for the decade of 1920–30 over the previous one between 1910–20. This situation has been reversed in the 1930–40 decade. In the latter period there was a 10-percent decrease over the decade of 1920–30. Births decreased 7.2 percent in 1930–40 over 1920–30, while deaths decreased 2.1 percent. The observation is made here that economic factors have undoubtedly influenced the birth rates. There is a sharp reversal in the trends between 1930–40 as compared with those prevailing in comparing the decades of 1920–30 and 1910–20.

Since 1910, there has been an increasing loss of population through out-of-State migration. The rate of loss between 1920–30 was nearly 4 times that in 1910–20. During the decade 1930–40, this extremely high rate of loss was materially reduced to approximately one and one-fourth times that of the previous decade. Thus, it is seen that the number of persons migrating from the State increased each period from 1910 up to 1940, but the percentage rate of change has greatly declined.

These trends indicate the nature of the migration movements within Utah to the extent of identifying its two fundamental migration problems. It is seen that as time goes on, migration losses take a larger toll of the State's natural population increase. Somewhat less definitely is depicted an influx of migrants to the State. Between 1930–40, this latter condition appears to have increased sufficiently to have made possible an 8.2 percent increase in the population in face of a 10-percent decline in the natural increase.

It is acknowledged that not only are these problems of concern to Utah, but also they are of immediate interest to its neighbor States. Where do Utah's people migrate to, is a question of as much concern to other States as is the question from whence comes the migrants into Utah. The directional movements of the population directly involves the whole consideration of availability, productivity, and use of resources. The only data available in Utah which provide for the study of migration movements between States are those of the United States Census. Wherefore, at this date, we do not know the direction of migration movements, during the years from 1930 to 1940, and, of course, cannot accurately appraise the effects of into-State migrations during this period from other areas suffering from drought and other adversities.

GROWING POPULATION PRESSURE UPON RESOURCES

The interstate interests are many that are affected by the internal problems of each other as regarding their migration problems. In many ways, population losses of one State result in gains to other States, and the opposite in instances is equally true. It would appear then, to serve the purpose of this paper, to point out factors which in Utah contribute to its relatively heavy population losses, and which also condition the State's absorption of new migrants.

When population pressures increase upon resources there are set up numerous stresses which result in population adjustments. These adjustments take form principally in migration or in the lowering of levels of living. To meet these facts realistically, it becomes necessary to take cognizance of certain general and unmistakable trends. The people of Utah have long endeavored to maintain a high standard of living. Their children have been imbued with the spirit of progress and the unwillingness to accept the status quo. Thus, it becomes necessary to review in general terms the predominant trends in order to understand why Utah has lost so heavily through migration.



The increase in Utah's population has not been accompanied by adequate development of resources because of limiting factors both physical and economic. This is not to say that every feasible means has not been employed to provide a favorable ratio of resources to population, but rather that fundamental developments have not been able to keep pace with abnormal conditions of depression, drought, and their far-reaching influences.

There has been an increased dependency upon the limited agricultural resources and agricultural industry of the State. The volume of industrial production suffered a sharp decline between 1930 and 1933, but has made steady gains during the past 6 years. This, however, did force additional burdens upon the land resources in the State, inasmuch as a distinctive feature in Utah is part-time industrial employment of a large number of small-farm operators. The irregularity of industrial production during the years from 1920 to 1930 had its effects upon migration from the State, and at least intermittently forced pressure upon the land resources.

The State's mineral production, increasing rapidly from 1920 to 1930, has influenced the internal population movements of the State. The expansion in the mineral industries during the twenties and the sharp decline after 1929, caused a dislocation in the population whereupon further burdens were forced upon the land. Production has recovered from its depression low and consequently payrolls have relieved some of the stress. It is observed, however, that these fluctuations contribute to migration of population both into and out of the State. It should also be pointed out that these fluctuations in the State's mineral industries are not always controllable, and that insofar as migration is affected by these industries, there is likely to continue resultant population maladjustments.

The decline of Utah's manufacturing industry, more or less a general one since 1925, has added to population pressure upon resources. The index of value added by manufacture reached a peak between 1927 and 1929. A long period of decline in manufacturing has followed. The impact of this decline is made manifest throughout the entire State. In 1920, there were 1,160 manufacturing establishments; in 1935 only 543. In 1920, there were 18,868 wage earners in the industry; in 1935 only 11,524. In 1920, the value added by manufacture amounted to $46,779,000, in 1935 only $34,852,000. The lowest year was in 1933 over which 1935 shows considerable recovery. The fact that the resulting loss has been widespread over the State emphasizes the effect it has had upon opportunity to supplement rural-family earnings through part-time employment in local industry. Thus, so far as the migration problem is involved, manufacturing expansion is necessary, the lack of which has seriously aggravated increasing population pressures upon resources.

EXTENT AND NATURE OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The whole question of migration in Utah is inextricably bound within the limitations of the State's agriculture. At this point it is perhaps most appropriate to review some of the general features of the incidence of migration as areas within the State are affected. The rural aspects of the problem most importantly qualify the considerations of it. The migrations by counties within the State is enlightening of its relationship to agriculture, wherefore a brief summary of trends within the counties should be of interest.

Based upon the birth and death data of counties, migration gains or losses have been derived for the period 1910 to 1940. The study of these data reveal tendencies which clearly indicate population pressures in rural areas to be preponderantly the crux of Utah's migration problems.

Between 1910–20 eleven counties representing 62.5 percent of the State's population obtained net migration gains. These were the counties in which during this period there was expansion in agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. In the following decade, 1920–30, only five counties registered gains through migration. The population in these five counties was 53.1 percent of the State population. They were the ones in which mining activity was the sustaining factor. In the recent decade of 1930–40, five counties showed migration gains over losses but they were a different set and represented only 16 percent of the State's population. The total gains through migration of all counties expressed as a percent of the State population increase during the respective decades have decreased from 22.4 percent in 1910–20 to 17 percent in 1920–30, and to 3.3 percent in 1930–40. Throughout the 30-year period generally those counties which sustained losses each successive decade were rural and basically agricultural counties.

Communities registering population increases during 1920–30 were generally those which serve as trade centers within their respective areas. Communities suffering losses were those small places having remote influences as centers and in character largely farming localities. Better than 75 percent of the communities losing population during this period had less than 1,500 persons.

Since it has been possible to associate Utah's migration problems with aspects of rural conditions in the State, it should now be proper to trace the trends in agriculture and rural industry which may make possible the formulation of a more definite conception of forces causing the State's migration problem.

A salient and determining factor in the question of migration is the fact that only 2.5 percent (1,324,000 acres) of land used for agricultural purposes in Utah is irrigated. Adding to this the dry farming land, the State has only 1,684,000 acres under cultivation. The total is only 3.2 percent of all lands in use. This clearly indicates a ceiling placed upon population growth so far as agriculture is concerned.

The number of farms has increased each period since 1910. By 1935, farms in the State numbered 30,695 which was an increase over 1910 of 41.6 percent. Less land was available for crops in 1935 than in 1920. "Smaller total production and more farms reduced the average production per farm for period 1931–37 to 76 percent, and cash income to 53 percent of that for the preceding 7 years." [1]

Farms have become smaller units through subdividing, their productive ability has been reduced through lack of adequate water, low farm price has reduced farm income—all are factors which indicate that greater population pressures on resources are likely to ensue. Migration is the only means of mitigating the consequential lowering of living levels of the State's rural population, unless these conditions can be offset by expansion in old and new local industries, and the increase in farm productivity.

The future of Utah's agriculture depends directly upon its relationship to the State's ability to acquire a more adequate water supply for irrigation, and to also more profitably control the relationships between land and water. A recent study of "Types of Farming In Utah" published by the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, shows that in more than half of the counties less than 40 percent of the lands have first-class water rights. There can be no question as to whether or not a more adequate water supply would improve the status of agriculture in this State. It would. Furthermore, there can be little hope in retarding losses through migration until this problem has been met.

Can it be met? The answer to this question is suggested by the following statement, "It is believed that by a judicious use of existing water supplies and the development of supplementary supplies through storage and underground water, most of the 47 percent of the classified irrigated area now having second- and third-class water rights can be given a first-class water right." [2]

Classes of water rights for 20 principal irrigated counties in Utah

Total acreage classified as to water rights	acres	1, 123, 445
Percentage of classified acreage by class:		
Class No. I	percent	41
Class No. II	do	25
Class No. III	do	22
Class No. IV	do	12

It is of particular interest at this point to note the association between losses through migration and the extent of first-class water rights in the counties of the State. Taking the migration losses by counties for the period 1930–40 as compiled by the Utah State Planning Board, it is possible to observe the influences of water upon migration. Nine out of ten counties which have less than 40 percent of their farm lands provided with first-class water rights had on the average lost 74 percent of their natural increase through migration. The counties having over 40 percent of their lands provided with first-class water rights lost 46 percent of their natural increase. Of course, many other factors are reflected in this comparison but the difference of 28 percent in loss is strikingly a large difference and there is little question of the water factor not being the principal determinant.

---

[1] Some Trends in Agriculture, Walter U. Furihman, bul. 286, agricultural experiment station, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.

[2] "Types of Farming in Utah," Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, bul. 275, pp. 29–30.

EXTENT AND NATURE OF INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES

Important as the agricultural aspects of the migration problem are in Utah, they do not transcend exclusively the influences of trade, manufacturing, and services. The industry and business in the State have been hard pressed. The volume of industrial production is just recently recovering from its low depression state. Output was long on the decline, and employees and pay rolls, notwithstanding recent gains, have not increased to previous high periods. Similar at least in one respect to the agricultural situation, the losses in industry and business capacity and activity are widespread. This fact now identifies problems in this major field as closely approximating in importance the basic requirement of water. The expansion of present and the development of new industry is essential in order to deal with the aspects of migration which are both purely non-agricultural and those which are interrelated.

MINING

The vastness of Utah's mineral resources cannot possibly be described in this paper; suffice it to say their quantity and quality have never been overstated. The extent to which these enormous resources can be and are being exploited (conservationally speaking) has a more immediate bearing upon the migration problem than does remote potentialities in the State's mining future.

To review the changes in mineral production is to readily see how profoundly the mining activity in Utah can affect population problems. The following table shows the value of Utah's mineral production from 1923 to 1937.

1923	$86, 221, 000	1931	$40, 301, 788
1924	84, 356, 626	1932	22, 620, 230
1925	100, 275, 442	1933	24, 311, 851
1926	98, 985, 218	1934	32, 527, 119
1927	90, 388, 455	1935	41, 881, 265
1928	97, 381, 148	1936	61, 209, 302
1929	115, 131, 131	1937	105, 652, 422
1930	64, 224, 307		

The foregoing shows a decline in value from the highest year of 1929 to the lowest in 1932 with an improvement up to 1937.

The long lean years of 1930 to 1936 in mining assuredly had their effect upon the increase in migration losses from the State during the decade 1930 to 1940. Continued recovery in this industry, started back in 1933 will mitigate these losses.

MANUFACTURING

The migration of population from Utah cannot be fully understood without reviewing the importance of manufacturing in the State and the trends within the manufacturing industries. The following table depicts the changes in manufacturing prominence and activity:

Manufactures

Year	Number of establishments	Wage earners average	Wages	Cost of materials, etc.	Value of products	Value added by manufacture
1899	575	5, 413	$2, 763, 000	$11, 440, 000	$17, 982, 000	$6, 541, 000
1904	606	8, 052	5, 157, 000	24, 940, 000	38, 926, 000	13, 987, 000
1909	749	11, 785	8, 400, 000	41, 266, 000	61, 989, 000	20, 724, 000
1914	1, 109	13, 894	10, 852, 000	62, 233, 000	87, 112, 000	24, 879, 000
1919	1, 160	18, 868	21, 455, 000	110, 154, 000	156, 933, 000	46, 779, 000
1921	645	13, 310	18, 392, 000	74, 873, 000	111, 055, 000	36, 183, 000
1923	585	14, 945	18, 344, 000	114, 183, 000	161, 607, 000	47, 424, 000
1925	517	15, 077	18, 200, 000	127, 543, 000	177, 225, 000	49, 681, 000
1927	556	13, 585	16, 689, 000	120, 567, 000	163, 118, 000	42, 551, 000
1929	651	15, 601	19, 699, 000	157, 902, 000	214, 629, 000	56, 727, 000
1931	573	10, 747	12, 498, 000	63, 673, 000	95, 781, 000	32, 108, 000
1933	440	10, 213	9, 299, 000	49, 363, 000	80, 968, 000	31, 605, 000
1935	538	10, 808	10, 304, 000	80, 268, 000	114, 167, 000	33, 899, 000
1937	552	13, 094	14, 479, 000	156, 911, 000	204, 857, 000	47, 946, 000

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

A rapid growth in the number of manufacturing establishments took place between 1899 and 1919. Since 1919 the number has declined to a point in 1937 when there were fewer establishments than in 1899. The greatest number—18,868—of wage earners in manufacturing were employed during the year 1919. The smallest number—10,213—employed was in 1933 and in 1937 there were 13,094, or only 84 percent of the number—15,601—in 1929. The value added to products through the processes of manufacture is possibly the best indicator of the manufacturing industry. In 1929 the value added by manufacture totaled $56,727,000. This dwindled down to $31,605,000 in 1933, but has since recovered to where in 1937 it amounted to $47,946,000, or 84.7 percent of that for the year 1929.

The most significant point revealed by these trends as pertains to migration is one which is also borne out by study of the industry on the basis of its distribution throughout the counties of the State. It is the apparent concentration of manufacturing activity in Salt Lake, Weber, and Utah Counties and greatly restricted activity in other counties. This indicates along with other considerations that small and more widely distributed local plants have been greatly reduced in number. It is observed that fewer plants employing fewer workers are capable of keeping up materially the output of the bulk of the State's manufactured products. There has resulted from these conditions definite local displacements of workers, creating in turn population pressures which make migration inevitable.

DISTRIBUTION

It is quite unnecessary to continue the tracing of effects of industrial curtailment upon the question of migration in Utah. As has already been seen it is certainly an important factor. In way of further emphasis, however, the changes which have taken place in the fields of wholesale and retail distribution are worthy of at least a passing comment. Since these changes are generally prevalent throughout the State the example of one county will be reviewed here to point out some of the relationships between migration and distribution.

Taking Utah County as a case it is seen that little change occurred in the number of retail stores throughout the county since 1929. The total volume of retail sales was, however, 50.1 percent less in 1933 and 32.2 percent less in 1935 than in 1929. The number of employees in retail distribution was reduced from 1,188 in 1929 to 823 in 1933, then increased to 1,157 in 1935. The average annual wage was 30 percent less in 1935 than in 1929.

In wholesale distribution the number of establishments remained practically without change since 1929. The net sales, however, showed a decided increase during the period 1929–37. The number of employees increased only slightly, while the total pay roll decreased.

It is obvious that such changes in the system of distribution as indicated by the distribution of an increased volume of goods through wholesale rather than retail channels and with a fewer number of workers employed that another aspect of the migration problem has presented itself.

As in many other fields so also in that of distribution the inexorable laws of economics and business continue to work. It becomes the task of the State to know the evolution of its industry, business, and people. Economies in distribution are wholesale and desirable. They should be encouraged, but at the same time the displacement of workers presents a problem which has not been much studied. It is one which commands attention and planning for the provision of opportunity for displaced workers. Without question, developments in the distributive field have in Utah contributed to the migration problem.

MEETING THE PROBLEM

There is no single cause for the heavy migration from Utah. Those factors which can be observed are complex and interwoven in very delicate relationships. Agriculture is dependent upon mining; trade and services are dependent upon mining; they depend upon manufacturing, and so on. All are, more or less, dependent upon each other in the structure of the State's economy. The one most positive solution to the problem is general economic recovery in all industry. It must be borne in mind, however, that trends in Utah's economic structure, its business and industrial organization and production have so radically changed, since before the "new era" of 1929, that to bring about a fully fledged period of prosperity is no simple task. Many things have gone under the bridge; their influences now are felt in stressed economic conditions.

The years of the recent depression brought us face to face with dwindling income, drought, loss of markets, low prices, diminished production, plant obsolescence, and a long list of other adversities and abnormal conditions. Their impact has been terrific, but much less servere than would have been the case had not many agencies been at work in the State to modify their forces.

It would be beyond the scope of this paper to describe the activities of these agencies and their programs for meeting our problem. It will only be possible to mention them. There are a number of Federal and State agencies to be complimented upon their work in dealing with these innumerable problems. The first steps toward the objective of providing for those who are forced under economic pressures to migrate from their homes have been taken and are being continued by the following agencies:

Federal agencies.—Farm Security Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Soil Conservation Service, Federal Lank Banks, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Mines, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Home Owners Loan Corporation, Federal Housing Administration.

State agencies.—State Planning Board, State Soil Conservation Committee, Department of Public Welfare, State Employment Service, State Extension Service, Office of the State Engineer, State Board of Health, State Land Board, State Farm Debt Adjustment Board, State Board of Agriculture, State Road Commission, Utah Water Storage Commission.

Private agency.—Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (welfare program).

COORDINATION OF EFFORT

There is a rich background of cooperative effort in Utah. The settlement of Utah by its pioneers, the hardships they were obliged to undergo in the building of a great commonwealth, is a history replete with unity of purpose and coordination of effort. The most essential requirement in meeting Utah's present problems is the cultivation of that spirit.

The fundamental needs in arresting the migration of the State's population are being met principally by the agencies aforementioned. The development of a new water supply through conservation measures and construction of small reservoirs provides for the basic need of water. Economic aspects of this program need be related both from the standpoint of agriculture and the development of local industries. In this connection the national-defense program presents unusual possibilities of great importance. The opportunity for effective coordination between water development and the encouragement of new local industry is without parallel in this State. The agencies now functioning in the interest of conserving and development the State's human, natural, and economic resources are fulfilling Utah's needs.

Utah State Planning Board,
By Thornton W. Petersen.

The Chairman. I also have a statement prepared by Dwain Pearson, farm management specialist of the Farm Security Administration at Logan, Utah, which was to be presented by the Hon. Henry H. Blood, Governor of the State of Utah, at this hearing, which I would also like to have incorporated in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Los Angeles, Calif.,
September 28, 1940.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION IN UTAH

The Farm Security Administration, a Federal agency within the Department of Agriculture, carries on a broad program of rural rehabilitation in which the State of Utah has taken full part, and in some ways may be said to have taken a leading part.

Utah is, of course, a predominantly agricultural State, even though only a small percentage of its soil is under cultivation. We have more than 30,000 farmers, and their farms cover some 3.2 percent of the land within our boundaries; moreover there is no great surplus of arable soil remaining which might be brought under cultivation. This in itself is one of our problems. It has already caused the splitting up of our farm land into smaller and smaller parcels, as our farm boys and girls grow up to strike out for themselves in agriculture, for it has meant that less opportunity or none at all could be found in agriculture for countless other farm youths. This trend is in a direction opposite to that in many other States, where a distinct movement toward larger farms is going on.

The great majority of farms in Utah are still what I should call the traditional type of American farming enterprise; that is to say, they are either owned or rented by the farmer, and they are cultivated through the seasons by his own labor, with willing family hands to help wherever help is needed.

Willing hands and fertile soil were once a combination that almost certainly spelled lasting economic security, health, and happiness for the American farm family. To our common sorrow, there seems to be no such certainty today. The 30,000 farm families of my State have met their full share of the problems which beset modern agriculture. Drought, low prices, insect pests, unequal competition, population pressure, and all the rest—I think none of them has passed us by. To use a simple, graphic phrase, Utah farmers have found the going tough.

Perhaps the security of a small farmer is not ultimately endangered until he begins to fear foreclosure on his land or possessions for debt. But on this score again, we are probably no better off in Utah than most other States. More than 30 percent of the value of all our farm property is under mortgage. Drought alone, which forced farmers to borrow heavily for feed, livestock, equipment, and even their own food, can be listed as the cause for much of this indebtedness. The worst of our drought was short-lived but while it lasted the harm done was severe and will not easily be repaired.

FARM DEBT ADJUSTMENT SERVICE

For reasons such as these, the work of the Farm Security Administration has meant a lot to Utah farm communities. I say communities advisedly, because the benefits of this program have clearly extended beyond the individuals immediately assisted. In the present connection, the farm debt adjustment service made available by Farm Security Administration comes immediately to mind.

Here is a program carried on in cooperation with public-spirited citizens of the State, who serve without remuneration in our agricultural counties on local debt-adjustment committees. Their job is to bring farm debtors and creditors together, on a voluntary and friendly basis and at no expense to either party, to discuss the possibilities of ameliorating debt burdens through cash settlement, refinancing, extension of time, amortization of old obligations, consolidation of debts, and similar methods. Meetings of county committees are attended by Farm Security Administration debt adjustment specialists, and proceedings are kept in strict confidence. The negotiations carried on are desired to result in arbitrated decisions which will be fully satisfactory to the creditor as well as beneficial to the debtor.

As of June 30, 1940, I am informed that debt adjustment cases handled by county committees in my State numbered 940, and that actual debt reductions brought about totaled $555,286. The lightened obligations obtained made it possible for farmers assisted to pay a total of $75,799 in back taxes into State, county, and municipal treasuries.

In reference to the drought conditions which, as I have said, have been a major cause of farm indebtedness in Utah, I should like to mention also the emergency financial grants which the Farm Security Administration is empowered to make under conditions of extreme need. Immediate help was forthcoming from this source in our drought-stricken areas, and in all I know that the Farm Security Administration has made more than 2,000 outright emergency grants in Utah to farm families other than those already participating in the agency's rural rehabilitation program.

RURAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM

This program of standard rehabilitation loans is, as we know, the principal activity undertaken by the Farm Security Administration throughout the Nation. Under it, in my own State, approximately 5,000 farm families have received badly needed loans for operating goods such as seed, feed, tools, and supplies since the then Resettlement Administration was set up in 1934. With these standard rehabilitation loans, also in the case of Farm Security Administration lending, has come valuable advice and guidance in farm and home management. I am pleased to give mention at this time to some of the concrete improvements in living standards and income brought about through Rural Rehabilitation activities in my State, as they are demonstrated in a survey made by Farm Security Administration in the early part of this year.

As of March 1940 there were 4,266 active rehabilitation cases in the State. Thus about 1 in every 7 of our farmers was operating under a rehabilitation loan. The average net income of the farm families surveyed was figured at $862.81 for the year. This compared with net earnings of $749.74 in the year before they came to Farm Security Administration for help, and thus represented an increase of 15 percent. Furthermore, the average increase in net worth, over and above all debts, including obligations to the Government, stood at 32 percent.

These 4,266 families were not considered good credit risks by regular business standards, or they could not have been approved for Farm Security Administration aid. Yet this same survey demonstrated that the typical Utah rehabilitation family had borrowed $1,214 from the Farm Security Administration and had already paid back $425.26, even though much of the money loaned does not fall due for 4 or 5 years hence.

On the side of better living and health, with which the Farm Security Administration farm and home management program is mainly concerned as a fundamental part of true rehabilitation, progress made has been equally favorable. For home consumption, our rehabilitation farmers produced last year an average of 538 quarts of milk per family, and 321 quarts of fruits and vegetables; and for their livestock they had raised an average of 27.47 tons of forage crops.

COMMUNITY AND COOPERATIVE SERVICES

I said in beginning that the State of Utah has in some respects taken a leading part in the general program of the Farm Security Administration. I had in mind particularly the community and cooperative service section of this agency's activities.

One of our farmers, in speaking of this Farm Security Administration program, made a statement which I, as a citizen of Utah, can sincerely approve. He said, when asked whether the cooperative tractor service he had joined was novel, and hard to get used to, "Why no; there's nothing new about it. It's just what we have always called being good neighbors."

As your committee may know, we in Utah take pride in being "good neighbors." Cooperation is truly no novelty to us. Those who first settled and laid the foundations for our State preached cooperation, and they daily practiced it. In the great, fierce wilderness, working together for the common good was a necessity for survival; but in the minds of the Mormon pioneers cooperation was also a spiritual and ethical and social creed. It has been said today in Utah, "We all think and act and pray together on Sundays, and we believe this is the way to do things on the other 6 days as well."

Perhaps then this background, this traditional ethical attitude of our people, has made the type of cooperative enterprise sponsored by the Farm Security Administration quite readily acceptable in Utah. But we are up-to-date realists too, and the economic realities of today's agriculture have also reminded our farmers of the lesson of cooperation.

A small, low-income farm in our day must face stiff competition for its products all the way from field to market. Perhaps I am stating the most pressing problem of all when I ask: How is the small operator to compete with those who have the most efficient of machinery, large tracts of land, fine livestock, and all the capital and credit resources they require? If competition is to be anything but overwhelmingly unequal, certainly the little family farmer must somehow gain access to some of these resources. This is one of the economic realities which Utah farmers, with their typically small land holdings and restricted finances, well know. Doubtless no one of us can offer any final or complete answer to this question, or, I suppose, to any of the other questions under consideration by this committee, but likewise any answer or solution which holds genuine possibilities of amelioration and improvement should be given its fair hearing and chance, as I am sure we all agree.

On the present question, and speaking of my own State, the answer submitted by the Farm Security Administration through its community and cooperative services, even though admittedly not ultimate, is a meaningful and valuable one. Through these services, which I am told Farm Security Administration now considers essential to the achievement of lasting rural rehabilitation, small neighborhood groups of farmers are enabled to purchase for their common use expensive farm machinery such as tractors and combines, and purebred breeding sires for their livestock projects.

The average Utah farmer has a herd of 5 cows. If they are poor cows of mixed breeds or bad strains he is often better off without them. A rise in butterfat production from 200 to 300 pounds has been shown to multiply milk profits 5 times, and such increases are largely the result of good breeding. Yet a purebred sire and an adequate pen to house him will cost some $200, with feed and caretaking expenses averaging $60 a year. When the bull can service 50 cows at the same cost, it becomes economically absurd for a low-income farmer to lay out this much money for service to his 5 animals, even though the need for pure breeding is undoubted. Why not let 10 farmers with a total of 50 cows in their herds get together to purchase and care for their sire? Thus dairy-herd improvement will be available to all of them, at a fraction of the cost to any one of them individually. In the same way it is uneconomical for a 50-acre farmer to pay the purchase price and overhead of an expensive tractor that can handle 500 acres, and equally sensible for a number of small operators to get together on the deal. What was needed to make real the obvious possibilities of cooperation was, in many cases, adequate credit.

Since 1934 this credit has been made available to over 6,000 farmers in Utah through direct loans made under the community and cooperative service program. More than that, the neighborhood groups set up have made their services available to another 4,000 farmers who do not require loans for participation but who pay reasonable fees as users. In short, 1 farmer in every 3, in my State, now shares the benefits of modern, efficient machines and fine stock breeding, and I am informed that cooperative services have cut operating costs of their members and users as much as 75 percent.

COOPERATIVE HEALTH PROGRAM

A word must also be given to the cooperative health plans set up through this program. In San Juan County, group loans were made to Farm Security Administration rehabilitation borrowers which brought the medical services of a physician and nurse to this isolated farm area for the first time. The plan has since extended to hospital care, and to many nonborrowers of the Farm Security Administration. In cooperation with the Utah Medical Association and other State and local health agencies, Farm Security Administration has now helped organize medical cooperatives in Grand, Box Elder, Wayne, Utah, Wasatch, and Juab Counties.

Cooperative groups meet often to discuss and solve their problems in free democratic discussion and by joint action, with counsel from trained local representatives of the Farm Security Administration always available. Educational opportunities of such groups are as striking as the benefits which show themselves in practical farm rehabilitation and higher standards of living and health. The long-range effects of this program must inevitably contribute to the welfare of entire rural communities. I am glad to know that Utah leads the Nation in the number of these groups established.

WATER-FACILITIES PROGRAM

Lastly, there is another department of Farm Security Administration activity which may be said to have rendered service not only to individuals but to sizeable communities. This is the water-facilities program administered jointly by Farm Security Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Federal Government. Under this cooperative arrangement, Farm Security serves as lending agency to make possible the carrying out of plans worked out by the two other agencies.

On August 28, 1937, Congress approved the Water Facilities Act. The act was designed to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid regions of the United States through the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for similar purposes. Facilities recommended for construction include ponds, reservoirs, wells; detention, retention, and diversion dams; pumping installations, spring developments, water spreaders, stock water tanks; facilities for flood irrigation; facilities for recharging underground reservoirs; and small irrigation projects, either for individual families or groups of families, including rehabilitation of such facilities.

The projects undertaken in this program are especially aimed at improving the water resources of small enterprises and communities, and may cost up to $50,000. Actual field work in Utah commenced early in 1939, and has expanded considerably since that time. Work is planned on a watershed basis, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics prepares a detailed plan for each area before construction of projects is undertaken by the Farm Security Administration and Soil Conservation Service. In addition to facilities for these principal areas, a number of individual and group projects have been approved for certain counties.

At the present time water-facilities operations are being carried out in the upper Virgin River drainage area and in the Sanpitch River drainage area of Utah. Studies and plans are being completed for two watershed areas in Iron County, one in Millard County, one in Jaub and Utah Counties, one in Tooele, one in Emery, and two in the Uintah Basin. We expect projects will actually be started in all these watershed areas as soon as the Water Facilities Board at Washington approves the plans and opens the areas for construction.

A total of 87 applications for water-facilities developments and loans to make them possible have been submitted from Utah. The projects when finished will serve about 700 farm families throughout the State, many of whom will contribute their own labor in local construction. They will require loans in the amount of $168,916.93 together with a Federal subsidy of $46,174.

As of August 30, 1940, 32 water-facilities projects have already been completed in the State; 20 are now under construction ; and 29 have been approved for construction. Only 6 of the 87 applications submitted have been rejected after review by the Farm Security Administration regional office. More than 100 additional applications have been filed with county supervisors of the Farm Security Administration in Utah, and we confidently look forward to equally favorable action and swift construction once new water facilities area plans and proposals are drafted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and approved by the Water Facilities Board.

We have noted earlier that a definite correlation exists between population loss in Utah and the lack of adequate water supplies. The benefits to be expected from this Federal water facilities program in reducing out-State migration in our rural counties seem clear. We have also found previously that those Utah counties which generally have sustained population losses each decade since 1910 have been rural and basically agricultural counties. The rate of loss has decreased immensely since 1930.

I feel that the decrease in the latter half of this decade has come from the increased security and stability of our small farm enterprises; and surely much of this security and stability has been brought about by the Farm Security Administration. Thousands of Utah farm families, I am confident, will bear this statement out.

The Chairman. I also regret the inability of Representative Harry R. Sheppard, of California, to be present at the hearing today, but he was unavoidably detained due to the fact that Congress was still in session.

At this time I would like to incorporate Representative Sheppard's statement which was to be given before the committee.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

I greatly appreciate the kind invitation of your chairman to appear before the Committee Investigating the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens. The problems of the hundreds of thousands of families who have come to this State in the last 10 years is particularly close to my heart for a number of reasons. The great majority of those who have entered California have entered at points along the eastern border of the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, or have entered at Yuma to the south. Those coming in through Yuma customarily pass through my district en route to Los Angeles, or the to San Joaquin Valley to the north. Many of them have sought seasonal employment in the citrus groves, the vineyards, and the vegetable fields for which my district is famous. Many thousands of these families have settled in the past 10 years in my district, principally in northern Orange County and in the area in and around San Bernardino and Riverside.

MIGRATION FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

These families have come to California in search of economic opportunity. A variety of reasons has led them to come to our State. California's reputation as a land of golden opportunity, rumors of high earnings which could be made in harvesting our crops, the recruiting activities of farmers' employment agencies in Arizona which lies just to the east of us, and other forces have served to attract the sons and daughters of the pioneers who came into Oklahoma, west Texas, and the Great Plains only two generations ago. Dust storms, mechanization, and contraction of economic opportunities in other kinds of work have made it necessary for them to take to the road in search of a livelihood.

It is a tragedy that California has not been able to offer jobs to them. From 1920 to 1930 the population of California increased by nearly two-thirds. From 1930 to 1940, the rate of increase was much smaller, both in total additions to our population and as a percent of our population at the beginning of this decade. But even though fewer people came to California after 1930 than in the 10 years previous, employment opportunities in the State have not expanded so that the newcomers could find a place in our economy.

Many thousands of them have come to California with little in the way of resources except a determination to find work. Instead, they have found an overcrowded labor market, inadequate housing, and a lack of understanding on the part of many of our citizens as to their needs and aspirations. These people have not come to California for the purpose of going on relief. They have been forced to accept relief because jobs have not been sufficiently plentiful to go around.

I am sure that the facts which this committee is bringing to light will bear out the truth of what I have to say. There is little that I can say from my own personal knowledge and experience which would add to the store of information which this committee is bringing together.

One thing is clear—the investigation of your committee in the past 2 months in other sections of the country, and the very size of the migration of destitute citizens to California show that the problem is one which is Nation-wide in scope, and which the Federal Government must help the States and local governments to solve.

NEED OF ADEQUATE HOUSING

In California the need for adequate housing for these newcomers is a pressing one. The program of the Farm Security Administration in providing sanitary camps for seasonal agricultural workers has shown how it will some day no longer be necessary for people to live along ditch banks, in the jungles, and squatter camps. This program should be extended, and in areas where seasonal workers come for only a few weeks' of employment, the establishment of temporary, mobile camps should be pushed. One of the successful permanent camps of the Farm Security Administration is located in my district, at Indio. You gentlemen have seen similar camps on your way here from San Francisco, and I do not need to tell you what they mean to the migrant family on the road.

Permanent housing is needed, too, for workers who are able to secure full- or part-time employment. Where land can be provided for subsistence gardening, this can provide supplemental income at seasons when employment is slack. Some beginning in this direction has been made by the Farm Security Administration. More of this type of housing should be provided by the Farm Security Administration and by the United States Housing Authority.

INTRASTATE EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES RECOMMENDED

One of the most important steps which can be taken by the Federal and State Governments acting together is the establishment of an adequate, workable system of employment exchanges throughout California which will make possible the efficient utilization of our seasonal agricultural workers. Our State department of agriculture is constantly improving its system of crop reporting so that it is becoming more and more possible to accurately forecast the demand for seasonal labor in different crops and different sections of the State. What is needed is a method whereby this information can be applied so as to avoid the purposeless, unguided wandering of agricultural workers in search of jobs which they have heard about by way of the grapevine. Such a system would be a boon to employers and workers alike in assuring a dependable supply of labor, on the one hand, the disappointment which naturally comes when two or three or four thousand workers flock to some point where employment for only a few hundred is available.

The thousands of unemployed agricultural workers in California, and the farmers who have been unable to market all that they can produce, both stand to gain heavily by measures which the Federal Government is taking to increase the consumption of fruit, vegetables, dairy and poultry products among low-income consumers who have not been able to buy enough of such products. According to a study of the United States Department of Agriculture, the 14 percent of our families with the lowest incomes are spending only a little more than $1 per person per week for food. It is broadly this group of consumers who are being helped to expand their purchases of food through the operation of the food-stamp plan of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. This not only means better diets for these people; it also means increased farm income, and more employment for farm workers, railroad workers, and persons in the merchandising business. It is a program which deserves our thoroughgoing support.

INCLUDE FARM LABOR UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Farmers and farm workers, who form an important part of the migrant stream of recent years to California, are not now entitled to unemployment or old-age retirement benefits under our national social security law. I have long advocated an adequate system of old-age pensions and have supported every forward-looking piece of legislation designed to improve upon our present system. I feel strongly that our present system of old-age pensions should be put upon a basis which would more adequately meet the just needs of our senior citizens. I feel strongly also that farmers and farm workers should not be excluded, as at present, under this legislation. The hardships which migrants have encountered in California would have been lightened if they had been covered under both the old-age and unemployment phases of our social security law.

In conclusion I would like to say that I feel this committee is making a real and much-needed contribution to the practical application of democracy.

And it is my earnest hope that our Congress will act with all speed in the adoption of such legislation as you gentlemen will recommend.

Mr. JOHN W. ABBOTT. At this time I have several documents that I would like to offer in evidence.

I would like to offer a statement by M. V. Hartranft, a member of the California State Board of Forestry.

(The statement referred to as received and marked as an exhibit and is held in committee files.)

Mr. ABBOTT. I would like to offer a book, Grapes of Gladness, by M. V. Hartranft, a member of the California State Board of Forestry.

(The book referred to was received and marked as "Exhibit No. 9." This exhibit, a bound volume entitled "Grapes of Gladness," is held in committee files.)

Mr. ABBOTT. I would like to offer a pamphlet regarding aviation training schools and employment in aircraft factories in Los Angeles by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

(The pamphlet referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and is printed on p. 2808.)

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer a letter giving data on increase to schools of Pinal County, Ariz., by John J. Bugg, county school supervisor.

(The pamphlet referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below.)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Pinal County, Florence, Ariz., September 23, 1940.

Mr. JOHN W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Field Investigator,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. ABBOTT: At the request of our county supervisor, Walter C. Smith, I am giving you the following information relative to the increase in cost to the schools of Pinal County, Ariz., incurred by the attendance of children from migratory families.

During the last school term there was an average of approximately 840 children from these families attending 11 of the elementary schools in the agricultural area of this county. The average maintenance per capita cost was $63 or a total cost of $5,920 for these children.

For this year the attendance in these schools will be approximately the same as that of last year, and added to this load we have organized a school for 200 pupils concentrated in the migratory labor camp at the Eleven Mile Corner. The total maintenance cost of this school falls entirely upon the county.

The added cost to our schools resulting from the migratory situation has been met by an increase in county property tax, and at the same time the valuation of our property has not increased.

If you should desire further information relative to this matter please request it.

Very truly yours,

John J. Bugg,
County School Superintendent.

Mr. Abbott. I offer a letter and a statement by Walter C. Smith, county supervisor, Pinal County, Ariz.

(The letter and statement referred to were received and marked as an exhibit and appear below.)

September 24, 1940.

Mr. John W. Abbott,
Assistant Field Investigator, Special Committee on Interstate Migration,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Mr. Abbott: This will acknowledge your letters of the 18th and 23d and assure you that your message to Mr. Floyd Brown has been delivered. He told me that he would sit down at once this morning and write his bit.

I am enclosing a rough statement with not as much detail or fact as I had hoped to be able to present. I am more familiar with the medical situation and the general relief problems than I am with the costs though I am somewhat familiar with the latter through the activities of the board of supervisors. I have asked Mr. J. J. Bugg to write the committee and I have asked Mr. Frank W. Shedd, of Toltec and Los Angeles, to contact you on a recent trip to Los Angeles. Mr. Shedd is probably as well posted on the State land situation as any man in the State and is the person I brought in to aid Mr. Darnton in preparation of his New York Times article on this county situation.

I am sorry I could not do better by you but our staff at the Inn is short at this season of the year and I could not get away to gather any more detailed information.

If you need any further help I shall be glad to have you call upon me. I will do anything I can to help.

Sincerely yours,

Walter C. Smith.

Coolidge, Ariz., *September 24, 1940.*

To the Special Committee on Interstate Migration, House of Representatives.

Sirs: My observations lead me to believe interstate migration of destitute citizens has created a national emergency. I cannot speak for the entire State, but I fear no good will come from this shift to the winter playgrounds of California and Arizona.

As county supervisor of Pinal County, I have literally been besieged lately with the borderline cases, those for whom no provision has been made or who do not come within the statutory regulations pertaining to county aid.

Only a few years ago the cotton growers of Arizona imported cotton pickers for the season and returned them to their homes when the crop was harvested. Then something happened and the small tenant farmers from Texas and Oklahoma started westward. Just what actuated the trek, I do not know, nor have I given it much study. Suffice to say that they came and came in droves. The pioneers came and found the promised land substantially as painted by those who recruited them with promises of "free water, free camps, no cold weather, eternal sunshine" along with good picking. Then followed the "in-laws" and the "outlaws" and whole families descended upon us until the little town of Coolidge has become known as the new capital of Oklahoma.

Case No. 1.—Just this morning I talked with one of the Farm Security Administration relief clients, 41 years of age. He could not make a living in Oklahoma because he was disabled. He, with wife and four little children, moved first to Texas, then to New Mexico, and then on to Arizona, and here he has been for almost 2 years. He says his wife and children can pick cotton in season and earn sufficient to keep the family in clothes and the Farm Security Administration can furnish the food and possibly tent shelter. Because he is unemployable, the Farm Security Administration grant office cannot support the family, so he must be referred to the county office of the State board of social security and public welfare. They in turn refuse help for one reason and another, and in November when this man completes a 3-year residence, he will expect some agency to take up the burden.

He did not come, he says, as others did, to bask in our winter climate secure in the thought of a living dole but because he was in search of health. He brought his family where they could enjoy picking in a region known for its two-bale-per-acre production. He hopes that he will get aid for his dependent children. When November comes and he receives no aid from the security office, who will feed the youngsters?

If the Federal Government cannot provide nor the State social security and welfare board, what will become of him and his brood? The county cannot participate. The supervisors are limited to medical relief. Sometimes, in cases of dire need, we do grant an emergency grocery order to keep the destitute from starving, but to do that much we must shut our eyes and act in violation of the law.

Case No. 2.—And what about the old folks who come out to sing their swan song? I have in mind an elderly couple who came out to this Utopia from Texas. Had they stayed on there, they would now be receiving old-age assistance. I worked on that case for months trying to keep their bodies and souls together and finally succeeded in getting the State board to accept them. They had fulfilled their residence requirements but because they had accepted groceries from the Farm Security Administration during their 3-year residence, the State board refused at first to acknowledge their eligibility for assistance. According to their interpretation, no one was entitled to assistance unless he had lived for 3 years in Arizona without accepting aid from any relief agency. Pending a decision on that case, the county helped with medical relief and a few grocery orders while the young son was unable to secure employment.

Case No. 3.—Consider the plight of this young couple. The husband fell from a tractor and injured his back. He was carried on the Farm Security Administration rolls as long as rules would permit. The wife is not well, and the county buried their two small children within the past year. After much effort I succeeded in getting them an allowance of approximately $12 a month from the State board.

Case No. 4.—An Indian, with no dependents, with inflammatory rheumatism, 43 years of age, returned to Arizona from New Mexico about a year and a half ago where he had been employed as a farm laborer. He cannot work, but because he is single, he cannot secure aid from the Farm Security Administration grant office. He has not been a resident of Arizona long enough to secure even medical aid from the county, though I have granted it as an emergency case. The man has attempted to pick cotton, but the joints of his hands are so badly swollen that he cannot earn a living and his knees and ankles so bad he walks with difficulty. So far this month he has earned $1.75. Is a human being who tries to work entitled to more than pity?

Of the four migratory cases cited—

No. 1 with dependent family is denied assistance because of poor health which makes him unemployable.

No. 2 with dependents is too old to work and is discriminated against because he accepted aid from the Farm Security Administration while perfecting his residence.

No. 3 with ailing dependent wife is unemployable because of injury.

No. 4 unable to do a day's work is denied assistance because he has no dependents.

And I could go on almost indefinitely relating specific cases. The files of the Agricultural Workers Medical Association could yield many more. May these few cases serve to outline the relief problems in different phases.

The Agricultural Workers Medical Association cares for all but communicable diseases. That throws an extra burden upon the county for all epidemics arising among the migrants. With no pest house and limited hospital facilities, the county is again up against a serious problem and, if history repeats itself, this winter the county will be forced to call upon some agency of the Federal Government for help, as we consider this more than a local problem and one that we cannot cope with by ourselves. A smallpox epidemic among the migrants cost Pinal County approximately $10,000 in the winter of 1938 and 1939.

It is certain that with our shortage of water and power this past season and the subsequent crop failures we cannot meet additional tax levies to take care of the increasing burden arising among the destitute. The situation is becoming more and more acute in spite of all the help given by the Farm Security Administration.

Sanitary conditions in this county have long been the subject of unfavorable criticism and such criticism has been justifiable. With an additional 26,000 acres of desert land in cultivation this past season for the first time and the increasing influx of destitute pickers, who will be unable to find employment, we face a serious situation.

Housing of destitute pickers has been partially provided by the Farm Security Administration, but we still find hundreds in improvised shelter on the outskirts of our little towns. This past summer hundreds were driven from their habitations by the flood waters of the Santa Cruz in the vicinity of the town of Eloy.

I have requested Mr. Frank W. Shedd, a grower, of Toltec, Ariz., and Los Angeles, to write you or submit to you information on the development of the thousands of acres of new cotton land, especially that land which is owned and leased by the State of Arizona, and from which no considerable tax revenue is available to the county to offset the social burdens imposed by the influx of the destitute. This matter was touched upon at some length in articles by the New York Times under the signature of Mr. Byron Darnton.

I have also requested Mr. John J. Bugg, our county school superintendent, to write your committee in detail relative to increased costs of education directly traceable to this influx of farm labor.

I cannot, in the limited time at my disposal, give the actual figures which represent the increased cost to the taxpayers of Pinal County which have arisen from this influx of destitute citizens. No exhaustive study has been made by any of our county officials. Offhand, I would venture an estimate of $15,000 in medical relief borne by the county in 1939–40 and approximately $55,000 in costs of education borne jointly by county and State. I cannot offer an estimate of increased cost of direct relief absorbed by county and State in Pinal County. Such figures must be obtained from the State board of social security and public welfare. (Refer to statement prepared and submitted by Mr. Floyd Brown, of Florence, Ariz., State board of social security, Pinal County office.)

It is unfortunate that your committee cannot find an opportunity to study the migratory problem on the ground here in Arizona.

May I suggest that some study be given by your committee to the necessity of providing relief of some form for the destitute who seek relief in this climate and who do not qualify for aid under existing programs and for those destitute citizens who become unemployable by reason of injury and health?

Also may I suggest the possibility of taking the entire migratory relief under Federal control or else that the Federal Government grant each community such funds as may be necessary to offset the increased cost to the taxpayers caused by this influx of outsiders.

Respectfully submitted.

Walter C. Smith,
County Supervisor, Pinal County, Ariz.

Mr. Abbott. I offer a letter by Floyd G. Brown, secretary of Pinal County Board of Social Security and Public Welfare.

(The statement referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below:)

Pinal County Board of
Social Security and Public Welfare,
Florence, Ariz., September 25, 1940.

John W. Abbott,
Assistant Field Investigator,
Special Committee on Interstate Migration,
No. 1639 Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Mr. Abbott: In compliance with the recent invitation of your committee, the following is a brief presentation of factual material which may pertain to your present study.

The major crop in this part of Arizona is cotton, and with the processing of that crop comes most of the social and economic problems of the large number of people who help produce it. Even drought has its effects in spite of the fact that we are under the Coolidge Dam irrigation system. In growing cotton quite different skills are needed among the men who raise the crop. Planting is mechanized, and it provides employment only for the younger men who are capable of driving tractors to plow, level land, harrow, etc. During the spring of the year, therefore, only relatively few farm hands are required for cotton.

In early summer, when the time comes to hoe the weeds and grasses from between the cotton plants, larger numbers of employees are needed. Apparently these include the tractor operators, but the prevailing pay is very small, and it is practically impossible for the head of the family to support a family group chopping cotton alone. So many farm hands are employed that the chopping is soon done, and there is usually a period of about 2 months between the end of chopping and the beginning of cotton picking. Only the very large families seem to be able to earn enough at hoeing cotton to tide them over financially until picking begins. Cotton picking usually begins late in August, but there is never enough mature cotton to pick to employ all of the available pickers until the middle of September. Pickers do very well from about September 15 to about January 15, but it is a rare father who can support an average size farm family picking alone. We find that even during picking season many experienced cotton pickers ask us to let them work on Work Projects Administration projects so they will have enough money to support their families. They claim about one-fourth of their working time is taken up with searching for new fields to pick after they finish other fields, moving their families from place to place, and waiting for bad weather conditions to clear.

A few years ago, I believe, migrant cotton families were not so faithful at sending their working children to school, and this resulted in a large family income during picking season. Many of them earned enough and were frugal enough to save sufficient funds to support themselves for the 4 or 5 months of very little available work in the cotton industry. That habit is becoming more rare, because parents and children alike seem to have an increased interest in full attendance at school. Not only do parents seem more determined to provide an education for their children but school-attendance laws are more rigidly enforced in recent years. In the business of interviewing large numbers of farm workers we seem to feel a trend against saving money for their months of idleness. Some families buy more permanent goods with their picking earnings, and others decide not to save for other reasons. An unfortunately large number of adult pickers spend their extra money at drinking heavily, and others complain that there is no reward for them to save because the spenders can obtain relief of one kind or another as soon as their money is gone, anyway.

Death, disease, and divorce take a heavy toll among people who have left their traditional homes in other States to follow crop harvests in the Southwest. Some workers are victims of unavoidable accidents, and some experience the common, disabling, more or less permanent illnesses such as tuberculosis, rheumatism, strokes of paralysis, etc. When accident or serious illness attacks a family, it is usually a very short time until they are destitute and in need of public assistance. As you know, nearly all forms of regular public aid are State-sponsored, and for that reason States must have restrictions that require relief applicants to have lived in the State for a period of time in order to be eligible.

On a temporary basis the aid which Farm Security Administration gives to unemployed migratory farm workers is a wonderful help to them. For several reasons, however, that service is limited to able-bodied workers. Except in slack seasons the most unfortunate families are those whose family head is disabled for one reason or another. After some study of the problem we would recommend grants-in-aid to States for assistance to such nonresidents.

There is one other very serious objection to direct relief for employable farm workers. Our years of experience in this line of work have convinced us that there is no efficient substitute for work relief to unemployed destitute able-bodied people.

We find that more migrants than we like to admit are not honest about reporting their financial conditions. We are sure that social and financial investigation should precede the granting of public relief. Even then the most efficient investigational staff cannot possibly learn about all of the temporary jobs that employable workers are able to find. It is our duty to report to you that many farm workers do not report their earnings from temporary farm-hand jobs when they are asking for public aid. It is true that this group does not represent a majority of them, for most folks are strictly honest in their dealings with welfare organizations. It is also true that farm wages are so low that a certain amount of rationalization is understandable. It seems to us, however, that the easiest solution for that problem would be to offer Federal relief employment to farm-labor families during slack-farm-work seasons. Obviously the work-relief wage should not exceed the best wage that a private employer could honestly afford to pay.

If you need specific life situations, more details, or further information on our part, we will be glad to do all we can to help in the solution of this national problem.

Very truly yours,

Pinal County Board of Social
Security and Public Welfare,
Floyd G. Brown, *County Secretary.*

Mr. Abbott. I offer a letter and a statement by Dr. Bertram P. Brown, director, California State Department of Public Health.

(The letter and statement referred to were received and marked as exhibits and appear below:)

State of California,
Department of Public Health,
San Francisco, September 27, 1940.

Hon. John H. Tolan, *Chairman,*
Special Committee of the House of Representatives
Investigating the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Sir: At the telegraphic request of Mr. Kramer, submitted herewith, is a survey of tuberculosis among transients for inclusion in the record of your committee.

It is hoped the study will be of value to the committee in its consideration of the problem.

As I wired Mr. Kramer, I regret that this department did not have an opportunity to present a report at either the San Francisco or Los Angeles meeting. Upon request, we will be pleased to give the committee any further information desired.

Very truly yours,

Bertram P. Brown,
Director of Public Health.

SURVEY OF TUBERCULOSIS AMONG TRANSIENTS

Presented to Special Committee of the House of Representatives Investigating the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens, meeting in Los Angeles, September 28, 1940

Bertram P. Brown, M. D., Director, California State Department of Public Health

Survey of Tuberculosis Among Transients, California State Department of Public Health, July 31, 1940

To determine, if possible, the incidence of tuberculosis among the transient population of the State of California a precursory survey was done in several of the counties in the San Joaquin Valley in which the migratory population was the heaviest.

Four counties with full-time health departments and adequate record systems were selected for the survey. These are Tulare County, Madera County, Kern County, and San Joaquin County. The records of the cases of tuberculosis reported in these counties during the year 1939 and up to July 1, 1940, were analyzed. A tabulation of these cases as to sex, length of residence in the county and State, and race was made.

A residence segregation was made from information available on the record cards and nursing records. Tabulations were made as to whether the residence was 3 months or less, 6 months or less, 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and over. A great variation was found in the counties as to the legal requirements for residence. Kern County requires 3 years' residence in the county and 3 years' residence in the State for acceptance in the county hospital or county tuberculosis sanitarium. Tulare County requires 2 years' State residence and 2 years' county residence, while San Joaquin County requires 3 years' State residence and 1 year's county residence. Tabulation charts showing the information derived from the four counties studied are included.

The following chart has been prepared for Kern County and shows that out of a total of 254 tuberculosis cases reported during this period for Kern County, 59 had less than 3 years' residence in the State at the time of reporting. Of this number, 11 were Mexican or colored and 48 were white. It also shows that the majority of active cases of tuberculosis are found among those people having lived in the county between 2 and 3 years. A further analysis of the active tuberculosis cases for Kern County shows that 14.1 percent of the total of 1,078 cases have less than 3 years' residence in the county.

CHART NO. 1.—*Tuberculosis cases, Kern County*

Age	Race	Male	Female	Residence				
				3 months or less	6 months or less	1 year or less	2 years	3 years and over
1939								
0 to 14 years	Mexican	3	4	------	------	------	------	7
	White	2	3	------	------	------	------	5
15 to 19 years	Mexican	3	5	------	------	------	1	7
	White	2	6	------	------	1	3	4
20 to 24 years	Mexican	6	2	1	------	------	------	7
	White	7	9	------	1	------	3	12
25 to 29 years	Mexican	6	3	------	------	------	2	7
	White	6	14	1	1	------	5	13
30 to 39 years	Mexican	8	5	1	------	1	------	11
	White	13	21	3	------	1	6	24
40 to 49 years	Mexican	6	3	------	------	------	1	8
	White	7	7	------	------	------	2	12
50 years and over.	Mexican	8	3	------	------	1	------	10
	White	14	3	------	3	1	2	11
		91	88	6	5	5	25	138
Total		179		41				
JAN. 1 TO JULY 1, 1940								
0 to 14 years	Mexican	3	2	------	------	------	1	4
	White	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
15 to 19 years	Mexican	3	2	------	------	------	------	5
	White	1	2	------	------	------	1	2
20 to 24 years	Mexican	------	2	------	------	------	1	1
	White	2	3	------	------	------	------	5
25 to 29 years	Mexican	3	1	------	1	------	------	3
	White	4	2	1	------	2	1	2
30 to 39 years	Mexican	1	2	------	------	------	------	3
	White	8	7	1	------	2	3	9
40 to 49 years	Mexican	4	------	------	------	------	------	4
	White	6	6	------	------	------	2	10
50 years and over.	Mexican	2	1	------	------	------	------	3
	White	5	3	1	------	------	1	6
		42	33	3	1	4	10	57
Total		75		18				

The following chart for Tulare County shows that out of a total of 120 cases, 21 had less than 3 years' residence in the county. Of these 21 cases, 1 was a Mexican.

CHART NO. 2.—*Tuberculosis cases, Tulare County, 1939 to July 15, 1940*

Age	Race	Male	Female	Residence				
				3 months or less	6 months or less	1 year or less	2 years	3 years and over
0 to 14 years	Mexican	2	3	------	------	------	------	5
	White	3	4	------	------	------	------	7
15 to 19 years	Mexican	2	3	------	------	------	------	5
	White	2	7	------	1	------	1	7
20 to 24 years	Mexican	2	2	------	------	------	------	4
	White	5	5	1	------	1	2	6
25 to 29 years	Mexican	0	2	------	------	------	------	2
	White	5	4	------	------	------	------	9
30 to 39 years	Mexican	2	2	------	------	------	1	3
	White	15	8	1	1	2	3	16
40 to 49 years	Mexican	0	1	------	------	------	------	1
	White	9	9	1	------	2	2	13
59 years and over.	Mexican	4	0	------	------	------	------	4
	White	12	7	------	------	------	2	17
		63	57	3	2	5	11	
Total	------	120		21				99

In Madera County, with a total of 67 cases, 13 had less than 3 years' residence in the county, 1 of these cases being Mexican. This information is shown in the chart which follows:

CHART No. 3.—*Tuberculosis cases, Madera County, Jan. 1, 1939, to July 15, 1940*

Age	Race	Male	Female	Residence				
				3 months or less	6 months or less	1 year or less	2 years	3 years and over
0 to 14 years	Mexican	4	5				1	8
	White	3	1					4
15 to 19 years	Mexican	1	4					5
	White	1	2				1	2
20 to 24 years	Mexican	4	2					6
	White	2	0			1		1
25 to 29 years	Mexican	0	0					
	White	3	5	1		1	3	3
30 to 39 years	Mexican	0	2					2
	White	6	3			1	2	6
40 to 49 years	Mexican	1	0					1
	White	4	6					10
50 years and over.	Mexican	1	1					2
	White	6	0			1	1	4
		36	31	1		4	8	
Total		67		13				54

San Joaquin County figures could not be obtained for the year 1939. There were 131 cases reported in 1940, 14 of which had less than 3 years' residence in the county. Of these cases, 6 were white and 8 were Mexican or Filipino. This information is shown in the chart which follows:

CHART No. 4.—*Tuberculosis cases, San Joaquin County, Jan. 1, to July 15, 1940*

Age	Race	Male	Female	Residence				
				3 months or less	6 months or less	1 year or less	2 years	3 years and over
0 to 14 years	Mexican	1	2					3
	White	12	15		1		1	25
15 to 19 years	Mexican	3	3					6
	White	5	4					9
20 to 24 years	Mexican	1		1				0
	White	1	1					2
25 to 29 years	Mexican	5	2				1	6
	White	3	2	1			1	3
30 to 39 years	Mexican	5	1				2	4
	White	5	5	1			1	8
40 to 49 years	Mexican	3	0					3
	White	7	3					10
50 and over	Mexican	15	2				2	15
	White	23	2			2		23
		89	42	3	1	2	8	117
Total		131		14				

The situation in San Joaquin County is different than it is in the rest of the valley counties. An understanding between the county hospital, the courts, and the county health department has been reached, whereby, on order from the county health officer, any case of active tuberculosis can be quarantined in the county hospital regardless of residence. The Filipino population in San Joaquin County causes the greatest difficulty as far as tuberculosis is concerned. Both the case rate and death rate of tuberculosis are high among this group. However, the trend over the past 10 years is decidedly downward. The Filipino population is not increasing, and the incidence of tuberculosis among them is steadily decreasing. It is interesting to note that in the tuberculosis deaths for San Joaquin

County, the relation of nonresidents to residents has remained practically constant during the past 3 years. These are as follows:

Tuberculosis deaths, San Joaquin County

Year	Residents	Nonresidents
1937	72	18
1938	78	18
1939	78	11

A compilation of all the information obtained in the four counties is shown in chart No. 5, which follows:

CHART NO. 5.—*Tuberculosis cases, 4 counties* [1]

Age	Race	Male	Female	Residence				
				3 months or less	6 months or less	1 year or less	2 years	3 years and over
0 to 14 years	Mexican	13	16				2	27
	White	20	23		1		1	41
15 to 19 years	Mexican	12	17				1	28
	White	11	21		2		5	25
20 to 24 years	Mexican	13	8	2			1	18
	White	17	18	1	1	2	5	26
25 to 29 years	Mexican	14	8		1		3	18
	White	21	27	4	1	3	10	30
30 to 39 years	Mexican	16	12	1		1	3	23
	White	47	44	6	1	6	15	63
40 to 49 years	Mexican	14	4				1	17
	White	33	31	1		2	6	55
50 years and over.	Mexican	30	7			1	2	34
	White	60	15	1	3	4	6	61
		321	251	16	10	19	61	466
Total		572		106				

---

[1] San Joaquin County, 1940; Madera County, 1939 and 1940; Tulare County, 1939 and 1940; Kern County 1939 and 1940.

This shows that out of a total of 572 cases reviewed, 106 cases have had less than 3 years' residence in the county at the time of reporting. This represents 18.56 percent of all cases reported. Of the 106 cases, 19 were Mexicans or Filipinos and 87 were white. On a percentage basis, 15.23 percent of the total cases reviewed were white, with less than 3 years' residence in the county, and 3.32 percent of all cases were Mexican or Filipino with less than 3 years' residence in the county.

Chart No. 6 shows the total number of cases reported during 1939 and until July 1, 1940, for the 11 counties of the State having the highest migratory or transient populations.

CHART NO. 6.—*Tuberculosis cases reported, all forms*

County	1939	1940 (to July 1)	County	1939	1940 (to July 1)
Kern	189	92	Yolo	56	26
Tulare	83	52	Sutter	13	4
Kings	54	13	Yuba	21	16
Fresno	244	96	Sacramento	276	135
Madera	39	27		1,247	616
Stanislaus	59	43	Total	1,863	
San Joaquin	213	112			

These total 1,863 cases for this 18-month period. If the percentages obtained from the specific study of the 4 counties are applied to this figure, 18.56 percent of the 1,863 equals 345.77, and 15.23 percent of 1,863 equals 273.63. These figures would lead us to believe that over the 18-month period approximately 346 cases of tuberculosis could be expected in all age groups and all races in the population of the State having less than 3 years' residence in any one county, and that 284 cases could be expected during this 18-month period among the white population having less than 3 years' residence. On a year's basis, approximately 189 white cases of tuberculosis in persons having less than 3 years' residence could be expected.

Estimates have been made by the Farm Security Administration during the past 2 months as to the number of migrants in the State. They feel that at present the total migratory and transient population of the State is approximately 69,260. A further study was made of the number of migrants between the ages of 18 and 22 of both sexes. This estimate varied between 17,000 and 18,000 as of July 1, 1940.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) According to these figures, approximately 18.56 percent of all cases of tuberculosis reported by the San Joaquin Valley counties have less than 3 years' residence in the county reporting.

(2) From reports obtained, approximately 15.23 percent of all cases reported by the San Joaquin Valley counties are white transients having less than 3 years' residence in the county reporting.

Mr. Abbott. I offer a letter and statement by Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, submitted by F. L. S. Harman, secretary.

(The statement referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below:)

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce,
September 27, 1940.

Hon. John H. Tolan,
Chairman, Special Committee of Congress of United States on
Interstate Migration, 1641 Federal Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

My Dear Congressman: The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has for a considerable length of time given careful thought and study to the problem of migration of families and/or individuals from other States of the United States into the State of California where it has been necessary to support such people on relief.

We understand that the California State Chamber of Commerce has submitted to your committee its findings of fact and recommendation and report covering this subject of migrants.

This chamber of commerce is familiar with the report and recommendation of the California State Chamber of Commerce and in the main supports those contentions as submitted. However, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce desires to file with your honrable committee at this time three suggestions which have been approved by our board of directors, and encloses herewith those suggestions which it would like to have inaugurated in your findings of fact during your committee's investigation of the migrant problem in California.

Respectfully submitted.

F. L. S. Harman, *Secretary.*

SUGGESTIONS OF LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(1) In attempting to help meet the Nation's migrant problem the Federal Government should not increase its total relief expenditures. Relief payments in many instances have been out of line with the incomes of a great many of our families not on relief. The liberal relief policies have permitted many so-called clients on relief which they were not entitled to. Adjustments of present expenditures, we believe, can increase Federal assistance in those States where the migrant problem is troublesome without adding to the total Federal cost; indeed, with a reduction in costs.

(2) We heartily support the idea of attempting to reestablish migrant families in their own home State localities to the greatest practical extent. These families can more quickly adjust themselves under conditions with which they are familiar. They will fit into the local social and economic life in their home States more

satisfactorily than trying to adjust themselves to entirely new conditions. Their purchasing power will be retained in their local community and the local economic structure will not be disrupted. On the other hand, if it is attempted to reestablish them in other State areas, there will be a troublesome economic adjustment during the period they are getting established.

(3) We believe that the Farm Security Administration migratory labor camp program should be regarded strictly as an experimental and demonstration activity. The camps already established are sufficient in number and diversity of character to afford adequate experimental data. They should be studied in conjunction with local communities and representative groups throughout the State for the purpose of obtaining all possible information that will serve as a guide. Local communities and farm employers should be encouraged to make use of these findings and to develop such improved facilities as will afford reasonable accommodations to farm labor.

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer copies of newspaper articles covering the question of border patrol of California State lines, 1935–37.

(The press clipping referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and is reprinted below:)

Following are copies of articles from the files of the Los Angeles Herald-Express relating to the question of border patrols at the California State line during 1935–37:

[Herald-Express, May 17, 1935]

ASSEMBLY BODY BACKS BILL TO BAR INDIGENTS

SACRAMENTO, May 17 (by United Press).—A bill which would make California a "closed corporation" to indigents as a means of relieving the unemployment situation was given a favorable recommendation today by the Assembly committee on unemployment.

Providing for the possible use of armed guards to prevent entrance into California of persons likely to become public changes, the measure represents one of the most drastic proposals yet submitted to the legislature.

Introduced by Assemblymen Kent Redwine, Hollywood, and William Moseley Jones, Montebello, the bill provides that "all paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons and persons likely to become public charges and all persons affected with contagious or infectious disease are hereby prohibited from entering the State of California."

Full powers would be granted the Governor to take whatever steps he thought necessary to enforce the proposed law during an emergency period ending July 1, 1939.

Under provisions of the measure it would be necessary for an individual to prove he was not subject to the restrictions before he would be permitted to enter the State.

Pointing to the steady arrival of persons without employment or resources, the authors said that "if this influx continues social and economic rehabilitation may be impossible."

The effort to isolate California in this respect grows out of the tremendous influx of population which occurred during the gubernatorial campaign of 1934. Thousands of people, attracted by the promises of relief made in the bitter campaign, flocked to California, making its relief problem one of the severest in the nation.

[Editorial, Herald-Express, May 21, 1935]

Extremely important to the welfare of this State and its citizens is a measure that will come up in the California Legislature for action during the present week.

It is known as the Jones-Redwine bill, and it is intended to keep outside our borders the horde of indigent persons constantly invading this State, and becoming public charges on our already heavily overloaded ability to extend charity.

Naturally our people are extremely sympathetic with those who are unable to gain a livelihood, wherever they may be. At the same time, it is a bounden duty for each State to care for its own needy, and everybody knows we have more than our proportionate share of such unfortunates now.

This is one measure that contains no politics. The authors of the bill are as far apart in political thought as the poles—one a conservative Republican and the other a leader of the epic Democrats.

Both these men realize the importance of relieving the citizens of this State from any further load, and hence in their measure they seek to bar entry to paupers, vagabonds, indigents, persons afflicted with contagious and infectious diseases, and those likely to become public charges.

In a ruling by the United States Supreme Court, as cited by Maj. Walter Tuller, it remarked: "It may be admitted that the police power of a State justifies the adoption of precautionary measures against social evils. Under it a State * * * may exclude from its limits convicts, paupers, idiots, and lunatics, and persons likely to become a public charge * * * a right founded * * * in the sacred law of self-defense."

California cannot afford to become known as the "poorhouse of the Nation." It cannot afford it financially, because our extreme resources are now being taxed to support the great number of unemployed and needy citizens we already possess.

Nor can California afford it merely as a matter of reputation nor because of the lowering of standards of living which would inevitably follow such a condition.

Yet such a fate lies ahead of the Golden State unless the legislature acts promptly and decisively to keep out the multitudes of indigent whose eyes may now be turned in this direction.

The bill with a tentative enforcement limit of July 1, 1939, requires all persons seeking to enter California to establish affirmatively their ability to support themselves and makes it the duty of government to establish regulations for enforcing the law.

This proposed act is distinctly emergency legislation, and it should be put through all the necessary stages of passage as quickly as possible.

[Herald-Express, August 24, 1935]

STAY AWAY FROM CALIFORNIA WARNING TO TRANSIENT HORDES

SAN FRANCISCO, August 24.—Indigent transients heading for California today were warned by H. A. Carleton, director of the Federal Transient Service, "to stay away from California."

Carleton declared they would be sent back to their home States on arrival here due to closing of transient relief shelters and barring of Works Progress Administration work relief in the State to all transients registered after August 1.

"California is carrying approximately 7 percent of the entire national relief load, one of the heaviest of any State in the Union," said Carleton. "A large part of this load was occasioned by thousands of penniless families from other States who have literally overrun California."

Carleton estimated the transient influx at 1,000 a day.

[Herald-Express, December 11, 1935]

URGE PRISON CAMP HARD LABOR FOR "BOX CAR TOURISTS"

As a means of keeping indigent transients out of Los Angeles, prison camps, at which convicted vagrants would be put to hard labor, might solve much of the city's problem with this type of "tourists," the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce today declared in a communication to the city council.

The chamber declared that the question of caring for indigent transients is becoming increasingly more difficult and that establishment of the hard labor camps might have the effect of slowing up "this invasion." The council referred the matter to the police commission for recommendation and report.

[Herald-Express, February 4, 1936]

INDIGENTS BARRED AT ARIZONA LINE

While a tumultuous row was raging in city council over Police Chief James E. Davis' "expeditionary force" of policemen to halt the indigents over California's far-flung borders, the lid was successfully clamped on the Arizona-California line today.

The spectacular row in the council broke out when Councilman P. P. Christensen, consistent critic of Davis, introduced a resolution demanding by whose authority the police chief was sending 136 of his "coppers" to the State line "trenches."

At the same time Deputy Chief Homer Cross said the entry ports on the Arizona boundary had been blocked against transients in an effort to halt the "flood of criminals" and divert the stream of penniless transients.

Within 3 more days, Cross estimated, the blockade would be similarly effective on the Oregon and Nevada lines, abutting California territory.

The skirmish began right after Councilman Evan Lewis took the floor to argue in favor of Christensen's resolution.

Meantime from Sacramento to Phoenix, Ariz., the reverberations resounded. At the California capital Deputy Attorney General Jess Hession declared he believed Davis' methods illegal. Governor Frank F. Merriam withheld comment but State Senator Thomas Scollan, who had brought about defeat of an indigent-barring law at the last session of the legislature, characterized the "expeditionary forces" as "damnable, absurd, and asinine."

At Phoenix, Attorney General John L. Sullivan caustically declared if California tried to "dump" indigents back on his State, he would take swift action in reprisal.

In Los Angeles, Councilman Earl C. Gay, also took the floor and hotly opposed Lewis and Christensen. "As usual," Mr. Gay said, "Mr. Lewis is talking about something he knows nothing about." His face flushed and making no effort to hide his indignation, Councilman Lewis leaped to his feet. His first remarks were drowned by the gavel of Council President Robert L. Burns, who tried to leave the floor to Gay. Lewis remained on his feet and continued to shout as Burns loudly pounded for order. Half a dozen other councilmen tried to gain the floor. Gay then resumed his argument, insisting that the action of the police chief probably was dictated by the police commission.

ASKS LEGAL OPINION

The Christensen resolution was amended and sent to the city attorney's office requesting that official's legal opinion on the following points:

1. Legality of the action taken by the police commission in sending the "expeditionary force" to the border.
2. Jurisdiction of the council over the matter.
3. Has the city the legal right to expend city funds for salaries and expense accounts of police officers assigned to police duties outside the city boundaries.
4. Are the pension rights of police officers assigned to such duties, valid in event any such officers are killed or injured on duty?
5. Has the police commission legal authority to detail policemen to police duty on the various State border lines, as contemplated in their recent assignments?

ORDERS OUTLINED

"Tactical orders" under which the city police were seeking to dam the tide of trouble at the border were outlined by S. L. Harman, assistant secretary of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. He said police and civic authorities were seeking to stop at the State line, persons riding trains without paying fares; give these persons the option of leaving the State or serving jail terms and finally, to discourage from entering California all auto parties without apparent sources of support.

In the sieve of the widespread border patrol, the officers by fingerprinting methods, expected to catch or at least keep out of California a considerable number of wanted criminals, Harman said.

[Los Angeles Herald-Express, February 5, 1936]

Rule Guard at Border Legal

Flaying critics of Los Angeles' swift war on jobless, penniless winter nomads, Mayor Frank L. Shaw today revealed a legal opinion by City Attorney Ray L. Chesebro stating that the police reinforcements of the border patrol, was authorized by the city's charter.

Meantime, against hesitant cooperation and even outspoken opposition from Arizona, Nevada, and Oregon, Police Chief James E. Davis' flying squadrons of 136 city police officers, succeeded in turning back hundreds of indigents and has caused at one border port, Blythe, a 50 percent drop in incoming hordes.

NO DUMPING GROUND

Mayor Shaw declared Los Angeles would not be the dumping ground of charity-seekers, fleeing from the more rigorous winters in practically every other State in the Union. He declared that on January 31, when the police commission showed him the gravity of the winter indigent problem with its trail of crime and added relief burdens, he asked City Attorney Chesebro for the legal opinion and received authority for Davis to set up the police "foreign legion."

"It is important to note," Mayor Shaw said, "that Los Angeles is facing a desperate situation if we permit every incoming freight train to bring us a new shipment of unemployed, penniless vagrants, to consume the relief so seriously needed by our needy people and to create a crime menace almost beyond conceivable control.

"Officials of cities and States en route will not permit these transients to leave the trains, preferring for their own safety that the problem should be dumped in Los Angeles.

"Our own recourse is to reinforce the sheriffs of the border counties with men loaned from the Los Angeles Police Department who can turn back the front ranks of these oncoming hordes promptly and in such numbers that the invasion can be halted at its sources as soon as the news reaches the east.

"We are simply trying to apply an ounce of sensible prevention to save a pound of costly cure later on. Critics of the plan have either not taken pains to examine facts or for mysterious reasons of their own are content to see Los Angeles filled with a homeless indigent army of thousands, recruited from every State in the Union and threatening every security and hope of our own working people.

"It is noteworthy that the critics have no constructive proposals of their own to offer with reference to this very real problem."

SLAP AT FACTION

The mayor's tart remarks were interpreted in city hall circles as a slap at the council faction which yesterday maneuvered a unanimous request from the council to City Attorney Chesebro for an opinion on specific points not covered by the opinion Chesebro gave the mayor.

A possible major development today was the suggestion of Governor Frank F. Merriam at Sacramento for a meeting of western States Governors to seek means of halting the westward tide of jobless.

"There are stations in Arizona," Governor Merriam said, "where chambers of commerce furnish gasoline to itinerants to help them along to California."

Speaking on the much-questioned legality of Los Angeles' far-flung expeditionary force, the Governor said, "I guess Los Angeles can do it; its city boundaries go almost that far."

Governor B. B. Moeur, of Arizona, declared, according to Phoenix dispatches, that Los Angeles was bluffing.

CHARGES "SCARE"

"What the Los Angeles police are trying to do is unconstitutional," he said. "They are simply trying to scare travelers away by threats of fingerprinting. I am investigating."

On the Oregon front, Governor Charles H. Martin said at Salem that the situation was alarming and that he was investigating through his State police force whether California's border could be closed to transients.

At Carson City, Nevada's Governor, Richard Kirman, said he was "not excited" by the transients' ban, but was watching a possible high tide of border-halted indigents, hurled back onto Nevada relief agencies. As the "war" went into its second day, wires hummed with communiques from the local front:

YUMA, ARIZ.: Sgt. D. A. McCoole turned back six transients.

BLYTHE, CALIF.: Sgt. B. B. Eubanks' detail turned back 200 indigents and reported the flow diminished to less than half during second 24 hours; 8 fingerprinted, 6 found with guns.

NEEDLES, CALIF.: Influx slowed down to a single alleged hobo. At nearby Cadiz, Sheriff Emmett Shay investigated set-up to report to San Bernardino County supervisors on advisability cooperating by deputizing Los Angeles "reinforcements."

TRUCKEE, CALIF.: Subzero cold had halted vagrant influx but Sheriff Carl Tobiason of Nevada County deputized Los Angeles police who showed up in arctic boots and mackinaws.

Alturas, Calif.: Fourteen officers denied commissions by Sheriff John C. Sharp of Modoc County till he hears from attorney general whether it's legal.

Crescent City: Del Norte County's sheriff, Austin Huffman, refused commissions pending inquiry.

Plumas County: Sheriff L. A. Braden cooperating but not deputizing officers from Los Angeles.

Siskiyou County: Sheriff W. G. Chandler deputized 14 officers from Los Angeles; 7 stationed at Hornbrook and 7 at Dorris on great Pacific highway travel artery.

Sergeant D. Douglas, in charge of the "expeditionary force," reported to Davis that his men were halting tramps riding the "blind baggage" of railway trains and hitch-hiking into the State in autos. Of 16 men stopped at one port, Douglas reported 8 were found to have police records.

Sworn in as local deputies in the counties in which they are stationed, the officers of the squadron were taking hoboes off freight cars, tenders, and blind baggage compartments and holding them on two charges, vagrancy and evading railroad fares. Railroads are cooperating with the police, Chief Davis said. He explained the only reason the railroads had not succeeded earlier in halting the westward influx of tramps was lack of special officers. Some freights carry 50 or 60 hoboes, Davis said, and the men on the train crew are helpless to throw them off.

The chief, meantime, defended his plan on the ground that in sending 136 of his men to the State's outposts he has taken a "humane and legal course and the only one that will work."

"For years various plans have been advanced for discouraging these people from coming to California but nothing very efficient ever developed," the chief said. "Now with Government relief being gradually withdrawn, the situation is becoming alarming, if not desperate to the residents of this community."

"If we wait until these thousands of indigents scatter over the 460 square miles of incorporated Los Angeles, the police department will have little control over them, but if we stop them at the arteries now being guarded, the situation is considerably simplified. If this is done, we confidently expect a 20-percent decrease in the crime total in the next 12 months. Records show that 65 to 85 percent of migratory indigents come to southern California. Fingerprinting of vagrants and street beggars recently showed that approximately 60 percent of these have criminal records. If we remember that to obtain Government work one must have been a resident in the State at least a year, it can readily be seen that the hordes of indigents are not coming to California for work. They are coming to get on relief rolls, to beg and to steal."

The chief said he expected hoboland's grapevine would promptly pass the word to jungle camps.

"Our work will be all the more effective and easier when the bums learn that California authorities are actively hostile to them," Chief Davis said.

[Los Angeles Herald-Express, February 6, 1936]

Report All Beggars Is Plea

Along California's hundreds of miles of land frontier and on the home front in this city, Los Angeles police battled today to turn back hordes of jobless, penniless transients, who are said to have been pouring into this sunny clime from the wintery east at the rate of 6,000 to 7,000 a month.

Developments in the police campaign included:

1. Police Chief James E. Davis, after a conference with Sheriff E. W. Biscailuz, called on Los Angeles housewives to report immediately all beggars who come to the doors of the city's residential districts.
2. Governor Frank F. Merriam was requested today by Governor Richard Kirman of Nevada to "intervene" and prevent Los Angeles police expeditions on the border throwing indigents back into Nevada. Governor Merriam was expected to ask Kirman to join in asking the Federal Government to take a hand in halting the migrant work fleeing hordes.
3. Ernest Besig, of San Francisco, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, a radical organization, demanded criminal and civil actions to halt Los Angeles police activities against the annual midwinter transient movement.
4. Sheriff Biscailuz broadcast to all sheriff's substations orders to enforce the State antivagrancy laws in unincorporated territory, with due care on the part of deputies not to hinder any lawful personal rights.

5. On three State "fronts" sharp declines in the number of "gentlemen of the road" were recorded by vigilant police patrols.

6. Chief Davis was refused permission by A. C. Fleury, chief of the State bureau of plant quarantine, to use State quarantine stations on the highway entering California, as police outposts. Fleury said he could not grant the chief's request until assured the police expeditionary forces were legal.

[Los Angeles Herald-Express, February 12, 1936]

Seek to Balk Los Angeles Police Border Guard

Arizona, which has been gently shooing indigents westward into California for years, rose in wrath yesterday and threatened to call out the State's National Guard troops because Los Angeles, with its police blockade, has started the tide of jobless roamers back toward the East. The threat was caused by the sidetracking in Tucson of a boxcar in which some 50 eastern transients had been started homeward by the police along the border.

TUCSON CHIEF ACTS

Police Chief C. A. Woolard at Tucson acted when his men arrested 22 of the homeless men. He asked Gov. B. B. Moeur to call out troops "to stop California from dumping hoboes in Arizona."

Whether the Tempe physician, who rose to the office of Governor of the neighboring State, would take this militaristic step was a question. But calling out the guard is no new experience for Governor Moeur. The last time he did it was to stop the Government Reclamation Service from constructing the Parker Dam, a part of the Los Angeles aqueduct system. The troops responded nobly, rushing to the river bank and then creating an "Arizona navy" with a couple of scows to patrol the water front. Today the dam is rapidly proceeding toward completion with the Arizona warriors back in their homes and possibly waiting for the new call to arms.

DAVIS IN APPEAL

Police Chief James E. Davis considers California is not "dumping its bums" but merely moving transients back whence they came. Chief Davis pointed to the rapidly dwindling westward trickle of transients and called on all California to purge itself of hoboes.

Chief Davis appealed to police chiefs in other California cities to join him in the drive. The response from some places was immediate. Officials at Santa Ana, for instance, said they had established a rock pile not only for hoboes but for drunk drivers and other offenders.

[Los Angeles Herald-Express February 19, 1936]

Group Demands Los Angeles Police be Recalled From California Border

A formal demand that Police Chief James E. Davis' "foreign legion" be withdrawn from California's borders was filed with the police commission today by the American Civil Liberties Union, which asked that the police squads be returned to the city. Clinton J. Taft, California director of the union, said his organization was prepared to seek a court injunction if necessary to stop the police patrol. At the same time written protests against the "bum blockade" program were filed with the police board by the Hollenbeck Borough Voluntary Board and the Hollywood Open Forum. While the protests were being received, the police commission approved the allocation of an additional $1,000 to the border patrol of 166 policemen, effective today; another $1,000 for February 20, and a third $1,000 effective February 21.

Mr. Abbott. I offer a copy of the opinion by U. S. Webb, former attorney general of California, covering the legality of border patrol, dated February 18, 1936.

(The document referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and is printed below:)

SAN FRANCISCO, *February 18, 1936.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. ARNOLL,
Secretary and General Manager, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce,
Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. ARNOLL: I have considered with care your recent letter, in which you refer to and in a measure describe the plan, having the approval of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, and which "has been worked out by the police department of the city of Los Angeles," having for its object the prevention, insofar as possible, of the coming to this State of indigent persons who will become a charge upon this State, and will to some degree, as you say, increase the probability of crime. Insofar as this object may be lawfully accomplished, it is worthy of unqualified approval, but organized government, neither State, county, nor municipal, should attempt the achievement of a laudible purpose by unlawful means.

The constitutiom of this State authorizes the creation of local governments, county and municipal, and those governments and their officers function within their respective territorial limits. The operation of one municipal government within the territorial limits of another is not countenanced or authorized. The operation of the government of one county within the territorial limits of another is not countenanced or authorized, nor can the efforts of one of such governments to discharge the duties which belong to another be defended.

The police of the city of Los Angeles have no jurisdiction beyond the city's territorial limits, and the police department of the city of Los Angeles is not authorized to interfere with or discharge the duties devolving upon police authorities of another government, municipal or county.

The independence of these several governments, each of the other, has long been recognized, and the instances where one of such has sought to invade the territorial limits of another have been fortunately of infrequent occurrence.

If the invasion by one of such governments of the domain of another and the effort there to discharge the duties of the local officers of such other government were permitted, it can readily be apprehended that the evils which might result in given instances would far outweigh any good that might be accomplished in other instances.

May I at this point quote a paragraph of your letter:

"The plan which has the approval of this chamber of commerce has been worked out by the police department of the city of Los Angeles, in cooperation with the sheriffs, not only of Los Angeles County, but of all border counties of the State; and this plan provides for the deputizing of officers of the Los Angeles Police Department in connection with border counties of the State by the sheriffs of such counties, with the consent of the boards of supervisors of these counties."

Passing the question of the incompatible character of the duties of a member of the police force of the city of Los Angeles and a sheriff of one of the counties of this State, we come at once to the question of the eligibility of a police officer of the city of Los Angeles to act as a deputy sheriff of any county in the State other than the county of Los Angeles.

Under provisions of the political code of this State no person is eligible to the position of a deputy sheriff in one of the counties of this State, except he be an elector of such county. Obviously the members of the police department of the city of Los Angeles are not electors of any county in the State save the county of Los Angeles.

The police officers of the city of Los Angeles not being eligible for appointment as deputy sheriffs in other counties, the sheriffs of such other counties may not legally so appoint them, with or without "the consent of the boards of supervisors of these counties."

No question is here made as to the powers that may be exerted within the municipality of Los Angeles by its police department, and no question is made as to what may be done elsewhere in aid of or in cooperation with the local officers of other municipalities or other counties of the State, so long as the law is not thereby violated.

Government, State, county, and municipal, should protect and preserve and defend general welfare, but this ultimate object should be accomplished through lawful methods. Government no more than the individual can justify the reaching of even proper ends through unlawful means.

Whatever may be lawfully done by the officers of one governement in aid and support of the officers of another, in law enforcement and the preservation of general welfare may be approved.

The apprehension of any and every person falling within the scope of section 647 of the Penal Code by the local officers of the local government in which such persons are found, may be lawfully accomplished. If by arrangement between officers of the different governments such action can be aided, encouraged, and supported, such arrangements as do not violate the law are of course entirely justified and defensible, but beyond that which is lawful neither government nor its officers should go.

On November 24, 1931, at the instance of a committee of Los Angeles officials and citizens, a meeting was called by the Governor of this State to consider identically these same questions, and as a result of that meeting the officers of all border counties were communicated with, urged to the greatest activity, within lawful limits, in an effort to check the immigration to this State of those who would here become a public charge. One or more employment camps, as result of that determination, were established, and for some months maintained, and the evil was for a long period greatly checked, but the effort was not continued through the years, and I understand largely because of the cost which resulted, and perhaps in some degree as result of the false security felt because temporarily this invasion had been checked. That effort was entirely within the law, and in my judgment should have been continued, for the good accomplished greatly outweighed the cost of the effort. I sat in that meeting and this office advised much that was then and thereafter done.

I note your statement "that an official of your office in Los Angeles has raised the question as to the legality or constitutionality of this procedure."

You are there referring to the procedure as your letter outlines it.

This office has advised, as I have indicated in this letter, that members of the police department of the city of Los Angeles may not legally be appointed deputy sheriffs in other counties of this State. Further than that I think no member of this office force has gone.

For a long period this office has keenly appreciated the existence of the evils which your letter describes, and during all of that time has aided every proper effort to check this invasion, and our attitude in this regard has in no manner changed.

I note your closing paragraph, in which you state:

"I trust that we may have your cooperation in connection with this burden upon the taxpayers of the State," etc.

In reply to this suggestion, I state again, we have during the years that have passed given the cooperation of this office to every lawful effort to relieve the State and its people of this unjust burden, and such efforts will continue so long as the evil exists.

The plan which your letter describes presents still other and different questions. The outstanding question so presented is: How far may one State go in preventing the entry into such State of citizens of the United States resident of other States?

As between the States, the right of citizens to ingress and egress has very generally been recognized and upheld. Full recognition of this right was given and guaranteed to the residents of the colonies by the Articles of Confederation. Those rights were carried and continued by section 2 of article IV of the Constitution in the declaration that—

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of Citizens in the several States."

Almost 100 years ago Chief Justice Taney said:

"We are all citizens of the United States, and as members of the same community must have the right to pass and repass through every part of it without interruption, as freely as in our own States."

This language was quoted approvingly by Chief Justice Miller in *Crandall* v. *State of Nevada* (73 U. S. 49), and we find no conflicting utterances in any subsequent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In *Paul* v. *Virginia* (75 U. S. 180), Justice Field said:

"It was undoubtedly the object of the clause in question to place citizens of each State upon the same footing with citizens of other States, so far as the advantages resulting from citizenship in those States are concerned. It relieves them from the disabilities of alienage in other States; it inhibits discriminating legislation against them by other States; it gives them the right of free ingress into other States, and egress from them; it insures to them in other States the same freedom possessed by the citizens of those States in the acquisition and enjoyment of property and in the pursuit of happiness."

Some exceptions, however, have been repeatedly indicated. A State may undoubtedly protect itself from the incoming of persons afflicted with contagious diseases, of fugitives from justice, of persons convicted of crime, and of persons whom the State may deem dangerous to its peace or who would, upon their entry into the State, be subject to arrest and imprisonment by virtue of some existing statute of the State.

This power to prohibit, however, the entry of such persons rests in the government and is to be exercised through the legislative branch of the government. It is for the legislature to determine the classes who may be so prohibited. The power to so determine and to exclude without legislative action does not rest in the officers of the State. It is generally recognized that the officers of a government may exercise those powers only which have been by proper authority expressly delegated to them.

Section 647 of the Penal Code, to which we have referred, and other provisions of our statutes may subject persons coming across our borders to arrest immediately upon their entry into this State, but none of these statutes confer upon peace officers the right to forcibly prevent such entry.

I have gone somewhat at length into these matters in order to point out to you some of the difficulties which confront us. So far as we may rightly go in this matter the conditions warrant our going. In so dealing with the question, however, we should always keep in mind the relative rights, obligations, and duties of our sister States and of the citizens of the United States. Other States will not be expected to complain of that which we rightly do, but they may be expected to complain, and their right to complain must be admitted, of those things which we wrongly do.

In this as in other matters we should steadily keep in mind that we are one of the sisterhood of States, and while asserting our own rights we should recognize fully the rights of other States. As other States must do unto California, so must California do unto them, for such is the mandate of the Federal Constitution.

Very truly yours,

U. S. Webb, *Attorney General.*

Mr. Abbott. I offer general data covering migrant problem in Los Angeles County, offered by Stephen A. Eross, staff member, Department of Budget and Research, Los Angeles County.

(The data referred to were received and marked as an exhibit and appear below:)

Bureau of Administrative Research,
County of Los Angeles,
October 2, 1939.

Order No. 3399, Report No. 2.
To: Colonel Wayne Allen, Chief Administrative Officer.
Subject: Cost of relief to transients in California.

Almost simultaneously with our report of June 27[1] on the cost of relief to transients in California, there was released by Col. F. C. Harrington, Work Projects Administrator, a research report entitled "Migrant Families."

The Work Projects Administration report is thorough, and leads convincingly to the deductions which are expressed. Therefore, it will undoubtedly be taken at face value by Federal and other governmental officials. But failure to stress the extraordinary effect of California receiving 46 percent of the net displacement of population leaves an erroneous impression of this State's crucial problem. Also, due to many great changes which have taken place since 1935 some of the conclusions in the Work Projects Administration report, which were validly reached, must be revised in the light of more recent experience and data.

Therefore, we have prepared and attach hereto, for your convenience and use, a summary account of some of the significant highlights of this report, with comments upon certain points which should be qualified or brought out in relation to California's problem. Tables and charts supporting our statements are also attached.

Certain statistics provided by this Work Projects Administration report, which were not available from any source at the time of our study, enable us to supplement our original findings. The following three points sum up the situation from California's economic viewpoint, in the new data obtained from the Work Projects Administration survey:

(1) California received 46 percent of the net displacement of population resulting from depression migration.

---

[1] Copy of this report is held in committee files.

(2) California's migrant intake was five times as great as the outgo to other States from California.

(3) If these same percentages are applied to the estimations in our report of June 27, 1939, the extreme seriousness of the problem in California is strikingly apparent, and it is ample justification for California's apprehension as to the future problems to follow from the continued influx of distressed peoples.

If anything, the estimate in our June 27 report of the numbers of migrants to come in the future understated rather than overstated the possibilities. This is indicated by the fact that the actual numbers of out-of-state migrants which arrived in May, June, July, and August, 1939 (25,583) exceeded our estimation (21,272) by 4,311. If the increase in immigration of the last 4 months continues at the same rate for the balance of the calendar year, the total number of migrants for 1939 will nearly reach the 1938 figure, although entrants in the first 4 months of this year numbered 50 percent less than for the first 4 months of 1938.

The conclusions reached as a result of this supplementary study appear on pages 5 and 6.

In addition to the regular number for your office, two copies are enclosed for Congressman Leland Ford.

Respectfully submitted.

H. F. Scoville, *Director.*

ORDER NO. 3399, OCTOBER 2, 1939

Subject: Comments on some of the principal points in the Work Projects Administration report Migrant Families.

(1) This is a social treatise of the characteristics and behavior of migrant families which received relief from the transient program of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration during the earlier depression period July 1934 to September 1935.

In the main, the information presented is based upon a representative sample of 5,489 migrant families selected from the total number receiving care in transient bureaus during September 1935—approximately 30,000 families.

The cited observations draw the conclusions that the migrant families were not adventurous or irresponsible in undertaking migration, but were in general, distressed groups who saw a reasonable solution to their problems through migration to another community; that few of the families were habitual wanderers; that unemployment, the most important cause of distress and as a reason for leaving settled residence, "outweighed the combined effects of business and farm failures, inadequate earnings and inadequate relief; and that ill health was second to employment as a displacing force."

As developed by our study, subsequent experience proves that farm failure has been and will continue to be a more important reason for leaving settled residence. See comments under (6).

(2) The last sentence in the Work Projects Administration report's "conclusions" reads: "The problem is national, and the need of the moment is Federal leadership in achieving a solution which would take account both of the needs of the migrant and the interests of the States."

This coincides with the observations of our study.

(3) The Work Projects Administration report states that direct evidence is provided on the normality of the migrant families, and it is suggested that if anything, they are somewhat "above" the average families on relief; that the majority of the families studied were young, experienced, and free from handicaps that would retard their reemployment by private industry; and that the origins and destinations of these migrant families were both predominantly urban.

Our investigation established that most of the migrants who are already in California, or on the way, are agricultural workers whose opportunities for reemployment in agriculture are constantly dwindling.

(4) The Work Projects Administration report justifies the relief program of the Federal Transient Service on the basis that "it did not encourage wandering. On the contrary, it prevented aimless wandering by relieving the needs which were its cause." Therefore, the report criticizes the attitude taken by States where migration is a serious problem, stating that "Such States are prone to insist that by giving relief to nonresidents they only increase the flow. Yet no one has demonstrated that the hardships and uncertainties of migration are undertaken for the sake of transient relief."

The data revealed by the Work Projects Administration report indicated an inordinate movement of migrants to California—but special comment could have qualified the criticism as pertaining to California. Such comment would have brought a keener realization of the social and economic chaos which threatens California more than any other State by the uncontrolled immigration of large numbers of destitute families.

(5) Based upon the findings related under (3) and (4), the Work Projects Administration report argues against the need for a separate program of transient relief. It further questions "whether or not severe residence requirements do protect a State from an influx of needy nonresidents," and argues for "broadening the concept that people do 'belong' in a particular place even though the place may not be able to provide them with the opportunity to make a living."

Our study has not been concerned with the techniques of giving assistance, but rather with responsibility for the financing of aid to migrant groups.

(6) The report states that "it is significant that the drought dominated the movement from the Dakotas alone." Also, "other States which contain agricultural subregions lost an insignificant number of families because of farming failure."

Subsequent data compel an altogether different conclusion now. Table A, appended hereto, lists by States the numbers of migrants (mostly agricultural workers) immigrating to California by automobile from July 1935 to December 31, 1938. Chart 1 provides a visualization of the flow.

It will be noted that the combined influx from the States classified as "drought" States constitutes 84.4 percent of the total immigration as tabulated. Therefore, it can be inferred reasonably that drought and farm failure have been principal influences in compelling migration. Currently, the movement of migrants into California is again gaining momentum, after a decided decrease in the first quarter of 1939. (See table A-1.)

In addition to reasons submitted in our previous study, further explanation of the persistence of immigration is aptly provided in the following excerpt from Refugee Labor Migration to California (by Paul S. Taylor and Edward J. Rowell, published in Monthly Labor Review—August 1938):

"Certain revisions are required with respect to earlier observations as to the causes of the migrations. The coincidence that most of the migrants came from the so-called drought States led to the tentative conclusion that the drought itself was chiefly responsible. The unabated persistence of the influx throughout the year 1937, a year during which the drought areas were greatly restricted, leads to the conclusion that, important though it was, drought was but a final straw added to fundamental changes that have been transpiring during the last decade and a half. The more plausible explanation of the movement now seems to be that it is the cumulative result of low cotton prices in the immediate post-war period and in 1932, the droughts of 1934 and 1936, and a growing use of mechanical apparatus, particularly the all-purpose tractor, in the areas of greatest emigration. These factors, in combination, reasonably account for a decline in economic status leading eventually to complete severance of all ties and to migration as a means of escape from a permanently constricted sphere of economic activity."

N. B.: Results of a Gallup survey (June 24, 1939) conducted to ascertain the reasons ascribed by persons on relief for their condition of destitution revealed that the largest group (23 percent) gave as the cause, the increasing use of machinery.

(8) The Work Projects Administration report states that, based upon the reports of the Division of Transient Activities, only 8 percent of the 198,039 family cases closed between July 1934 and September 1935 (in all of the States) were transferred to resident relief. Also, "specific evidence has been presented to show that (migrant) families' * * * efforts at relocation, by and large, were successful, and therefore made only temporary demands upon the transient relief program." And again, "Transient relief provided necessary but interim assistance to migrants who in most instances had definite objectives and who were frequently only temporarily in need."

Our study ascertained that impelling economic and other forces will influence a continuance of relocation migration, and that the large numbers of agricultural workers, migrating to California, where there is an inadequate opportunity for agricultural laborers, will in all probability be earning such small sums as to compel them not only to go on relief, but to remain on relief for protracted periods.

(9) The Work Projects Administration report states that the migrant families studied were preponderantly native-born white families, the average consisting of 3.1 persons.

Our study revealed also that the migrant families arriving in California are native-born white, but that the family groups average 4.2 persons.

(10) The Work Projects Administration report determined that California is the chief destination for homeless families, and the general trend of their migration is westward.

Confirms our study on these points.

(11) The Work Projects Administration report concludes that of the 29,885 migrant families studied, only one-third of the transient movement has resulted in an actual displacement of population with most of the moving resulting in a balanced interchange among States.

The one-third net displacement equals 10,524 families. Table B, attached, shows that 4,803, or 46 percent of the net displacement, accrued to California. The remaining 54 percent divided among 16 other States gaining migrants over losses, with Colorado second, gaining 1,009 families, or 9.6 percent of the net displacement. See chart No. 2. As also will be seen from table C, California's migrant intake was five times as great as the outgo of migrants from California to other States.

Our study suggested the possibility that Federal aid at the source would contribute to slowing migration. A recent news article in the Los Angeles Times quotes the Farm Security Administration as reporting that its program was "beginning to make a dent in the California situation," and that there will be available by the end of this year, permanent labor homes, tin shelters, and tent platforms for approximately 7,000 families. Tables and additional data developed in our studies tend to show that by the end of 1940 upwards of 100,000 needy migrant families will have reached California by automobile. The very bad situation which existed in 1935 has since been aggravated by subsequent heavy influx of such families seeking relocation or manual employment, and distress migration into California is continuing at an alarming rate. Therefore, the Federal program, unless greatly accelerated in the immediate future, will not be very effective in promptly relieving California's difficulties.

The figures on the heavy influx of migrants into California are supported also by the recent statistics relating to population growth in California. According to an estimate made by the California Taxpayers' Association (Tax Digest, December 1938) California's gain in population from migration, during the period 1934 to January 1939 (722,586) increased 54 percent over the period 1930–34 (467,283). While all are not distress migrants, there is seen in this increased gain at least partial confirmation of the fact that large numbers of migrants in need have arrived and continue to remain in the State.

Conclusions.—From the foregoing it can be concluded:

(1) That the Federal Government's responsibility to shoulder the problems of relief and rehabilitation of destitute families seeking betterment of their economic status by migration to other communities is recognized by both the Work Projects Administration and the Farm Security Administration.

(2) That since California receives a number of displaced destitute migrants almost equal to that number accruing to all of the other States, the Federal Government's program of assisting such peoples should be based upon distribution of Federal assistance to the States on a similar proportionate basis.

(3) That the influx of destitute migrant families into California has been steady over the last 4-year period and continues and promises to continue at a heavy, steady pace. This places a severe strain on California institutions, a devastating drain on its resources, and creates an unhealthy social and economic condition due to the presence of a large dependent class. Any Federal program aimed at ameliorating this condition should be launched promptly, and on such a scale as to quickly and definitely stop the flow of needy families into California.

(4) That any such Federal program should comprehend a far-sighted economic expansion to attract a majority of these groups away from California to other areas in which their improved social and economic status could be assured by occupations suitable either to their present skills or to skills in which they could be developed for profitable production.

(5) That any such Federal program should also include provisions to assist California to care for adequately and to rehabilitate the large numbers of such people who are already within its borders and who cannot or will not be withdrawn by movements to other States or to return to their States of origin.

TABLE A.—*Migrants in need of manual employment entering California by motor vehicle, by States, July 1, 1935–Dec. 31, 1938* [1]

State of origin	1935, last 6 months	1936	1937	1938	Total 42 months	
					Number	Percent
All States excluding California:						
Number	32, 559	84, 833	90, 761	67, 664	285, 817	---------
Percent	14. 9	29. 7	31. 7	23. 7	---------	100. 0
Drought States	32, 185	73, 187	78, 332	57, 307	241, 011	84. 4
Oklahoma	7, 561	29, 989	21, 709	13, 212	65, 471	22. 9
Texas	3, 631	8, 304	8, 723	8, 684	29, 342	10. 4
Arizona	3, 097	7, 329	10, 613	10, 668	31, 907	11. 3
Arkansas	2, 866	6, 890	7, 232	5, 180	22, 168	7. 7
Missouri	2, 426	5, 873	6, 316	4, 077	18, 692	6. 5
Kansas	2, 238	3, 900	4, 484	2, 209	12, 831	4. 5
Colorado	1, 584	2, 249	3, 702	2, 428	9, 963	3. 5
New Mexico	1, 578	2, 440	2, 680	2, 457	9, 155	3. 2
Nebraska	1, 258	3, 019	3, 024	1, 403	8, 704	3. 0
Idaho	1, 193	1, 733	2, 012	1, 514	6, 452	2. 3
Montana	834	969	1, 102	858	3, 763	1. 3
Utah	678	1, 069	1, 063	623	3, 433	1. 2
Iowa	703	1, 474	1, 024	770	3, 971	1. 4
Nevada	502	614	923	923	2, 962	1. 0
North Dakota	532	912	834	387	2, 665	. 9
Minnesota	487	825	707	422	2, 441	. 8
South Dakota	468	1, 067	1, 164	526	3, 225	1. 1
Wyoming	337	738	659	491	2, 225	. 8
Wisconsin	212	793	361	275	1, 641	. 6
Pacific States	5, 822	6, 685	8, 831	6, 656	27, 994	9. 8
Oregon	3, 629	4, 384	5, 592	4, 350	17, 955	6. 3
Washington	2, 193	2, 301	3, 239	2, 306	10, 039	3. 5
Industrial States	3, 106	3, 261	2, 091	2, 058	10, 516	3. 7
Illinois	818	1, 066	605	693	3, 182	1. 1
Michigan	658	827	456	398	2, 339	. 8
New York	486	274	186	222	1, 168	. 4
Ohio	436	468	259	350	1, 513	. 6
Indiana	319	444	331	229	1, 323	. 5
Pennsylvania	278	106	188	107	679	. 2
New Jersey	111	76	66	59	312	. 1
Southern States	1, 205	1, 516	1, 346	1, 530	5, 597	1. 9
Tennessee	298	371	294	317	1, 280	. 5
Georgia	207	140	96	105	548	. 2
Louisiana	145	190	258	276	869	. 3
Florida	95	176	98	168	537	. 2
Alabama	120	153	137	150	560	2
Kentucky	101	152	137	133	523	. 2
Mississippi	71	143	101	153	468	. 2
Virginia	57	23	23	31	134	(2)
West Virginia	32	29	19	34	114	(2)
Maryland	29	50	24	37	140	(2)
North Carolina	15	58	109	67	249	. 1
District of Columbia	19	16	14	10	59	(2)
South Carolina	16	12	34	49	111	(2)
Delaware	---------	3	2	---------	5	(2)
New England States	241	184	161	113	699	. 2
Massachusetts	113	79	86	44	322	. 1
Rhode Island	31	10	17	9	67	(2)
Maine	40	---------	3	11	54	(2)
Connecticut	36	67	40	21	164	(2)
Vermont	13	15	8	14	50	(2)
New Hampshire	8	13	7	14	42	(2)
California	9, 901	12, 839	14, 215	17, 487	54, 442	---------

---

[1] Data collected by border inspectors of Bureau of Plant Quarantine, California Department of Agriculture.
[2] Less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

TABLE A-1.—*Comparison, by months, for 1938 and 1939, of numbers of migrants "in need of manual employment" entering California by motor vehicle*

Month	1938			1939		
	Returning California	Outstate migration	Total	Returning California	Outstate migration	Total
January	2,903	8,724	11,627	1,288	3,792	5,080
February	1,494	7,583	9,077	742	2,840	3,582
March	1,460	7,470	8,930	575	3,790	4,365
April	952	6,510	7,462	748	4,848	5,596
Total 4 months	6,809	30,287	37,096	3,353	15,270	18,623
May	1,094	5,987	7,081	846	5,777	6,623
June	1,081	4,512	5,593	1,064	6,261	7,325
July	1,401	3,897	5,298	1,503	6,473	7,976
August	1,213	4,164	5,377	1,193	70,072	8,265
	4,789	18,560	23,349	4,606	25,583	30,189
Total 8 months	11,598	48,847	60,445	7,959	40,853	48,812
September	1,651	4,130	5,781			
October	1,330	5,343	6,693			
November	1,738	6,055	7,793			
December	1,150	3,289	4,439			
	5,889	18,817	24,706			
Year's total	17,487	67,664	85,151			

Source: Data collected from Bureau of Plant Quarantine, California Department of Agriculture.

TABLE B.—*Net population displacement and reciprocated movement through migrant family emigration and immigration, June 1935*

State	Migrant families		Net displacement		Reciprocated movement
	Emigrating from—	Immigrating to—	Increase	Loss	
Alabama	596	417		179	417
Arizona	466	225		241	225
Arkansas	1,161	693		468	693
California	1,193	5,996	4,803		1,193
Colorado	838	1,847	1,009		838
Connecticut	207	27		180	27
Delaware	53	48		5	48
District of Columbia	119	379	260		119
Florida	534	709	175		534
Georgia	690	393		297	393
Idaho	327	966	639		327
Illinois	1,264	1,515	251		1,264
Indiana	685	315		370	315
Iowa	522	391		131	391
Kansas	1,091	1,368	277		1,091
Kentucky	657	54		603	54
Louisiana	504	816	312		504
Maine	78	12		66	12
Maryland	209	272	63		209
Massachusetts	284	72		212	72
Michigan	799	676		123	676
Minnesota	334	358	24		334
Mississippi	609	128		481	128
Missouri	1,818	1,026		792	1,026
Montana	264	97		167	97
Nebraska	809	288		521	288
Nevada	120	42		78	42
New Hampshire	19	126	107		19
New Jersey	592	537		55	537
New Mexico	369	714	345		369
New York	1,074	1,472	398		1,074
North Carolina	409	48		361	48
North Dakota	318	11		307	11
Ohio	843	1,479	636		843

TABLE B.—*Net population displacement and reciprocated movement through migrant family emigration and immigration, June 1935*—Continued

State	Migrant families		Net displacement		Reciprocated movement
	Emigrating from—	Immigrating to—	Increase	Loss	
Oklahoma	2,633	606	----------	2,027	606
Oregon	503	755	252	----------	503
Pennsylvania	1,140	594	----------	546	594
Rhode Island	59	48	----------	11	48
South Carolina	299	193	----------	106	193
South Dakota	521	5	----------	516	5
Tennessee	687	918	231	----------	687
Texas	1,971	1,070	----------	901	1,070
Utah	239	145	----------	94	145
Vermont	86	----------	----------	86	----------
Virginia	375	233	----------	142	233
Washington	631	1,373	742	----------	631
West Virginia	341	41	----------	300	41
Wisconsin	318	207	----------	111	207
Wyoming	227	180	----------	47	180
Total	29,885	29,885	10,524	10,524	19,361

Source: Works Progress Administration—Division of Social Research "Migrant Families," p. 150.

TABLE C.—*Interchange of migrants between California and the other States*[1]

	California	
	Accrued from—	Lost to—
Alabama	29	13
Arizona	239	14
Arkansas	188	16
California	----------	----------
Colorado	279	103
Connecticut	22	2
Delaware	1	2
District of Columbia	18	8
Florida	34	18
Georgia	25	7
Idaho	86	43
Illinois	281	81
Indiana	119	13
Iowa	126	26
Kansas	193	56
Kentucky	40	2
Louisiana	64	23
Maine	8	----------
Maryland	13	11
Massachusetts	34	4
Michigan	127	18
Minnesota	69	12
Mississippi	61	1
Missouri	381	59
Montana	40	5
Nebraska	160	30
Nevada	57	10
New Hampshire	2	2
New Jersey	52	6
New Mexico	136	43
New York	255	40
North Carolina	18	1
North Dakota	30	----------
Ohio	196	31
Oklahoma	916	30
Oregon	233	141
Pennsylvania	138	13
Rhode Island	6	----------
South Carolina	6	3
South Dakota	65	----------
Tennessee	68	19
Texas	624	68
Utah	140	26
Vermont	4	----------
Virginia	17	1
Washington	300	166
West Virginia	15	1
Wisconsin	45	10
Wyoming	36	15
Total	5,996 1,193	1,193 ----------
Net accrual to California	4,803	----------

---

[1] Source: Table 5—State of Origin and State of Transient Bureau registration of migrant families, June 30, 1935. Works Progress Administration Division of Social Research, migrant families, p. 140. 29,885 families.

CHART NO. 1.

MIGRANTS "IN NEED OF MANUAL EMPLOYMENT" – ENTERING CALIFORNIA BY MOTOR VEHICLE, BY STATES, FROM JULY 1, 1935 TO DECEMBER 31, 1938.

NOTE — "RETURNING CALIFORNIANS" NOT INCLUDED.

SOURCE: DATA COLLECTED BY BORDER INSPECTORS OF BUREAU OF PLANT QUARANTINE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.


NUMBER OF MIGRANTS REPRESENTED BY AREA OF CIRCLE
50,000
25,000
10,000
5,000
1,000
500
100 or less

CHART NO 2

NET POPULATION DISPLACEMENT THROUGH MIGRANT FAMILY EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION REGISTERED WITH FEDERAL TRANSIENT SERVICE ON JUNE 30, 1935



SOURCE: WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION, DIVISION OF SOCIAL RESEARCH — "MIGRANT FAMILIES"-1936

Mr. Abbott. I offer a report of indigent alien transients compiled by James E. Davis, former chief of police, Los Angeles, dated March 11, 1936. (The report referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below. Attention is called to a later document by Mr. Davis, appearing on p. 3012, on related subjects.)

REPORT BY JAMES E. DAVIS, CHIEF OF POLICE, LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT, MARCH 11, 1936[1]

Report of Indigent Alien Transients

I. CAUSES FOR ACTION

1. Annual winter increase of approximately 20 percent in crime in Los Angeles can be attributed to transients. (See exhibit No. IV and IV–A.)
2. Check at Colton and Victorville in January 1936 for 60 hours indicated 561 entering on trains at these two points. (See exhibit No. II.)
3. Check of vagrants arrested in Los Angeles showed 48 percent had prior criminal records. (See exhibit No. III.)
4. Liquidation of Federal transient camps in October 1935, without due notice being given the jurisdictions concerned:
    a. 306,064 in these camps.
    b. 40,530, or approximately one-seventh of this number in California. (See exhibits Nos. I and I–A.)
5. Of the persons arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department, who were convicted and sentenced on the offense charged, in the month of January 1936, 26 percent had been in the county less than 1 year and 22 percent in the State less than 1 year. (See exhibit No. VI.)
6. Of the persons arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department and committed to the State's prison, 26 percent were in the county less than 1 year (see exhibit No. V), and 20 percent in the State less than 1 year (see exhibit No. V–A).
7. Twenty-eight percent of subjects committed to San Quentin and Folsom during the fiscal year 1934–35 had resided in Los Angeles County less than 1 year. The study also indicated that over a 5-year period 26 to 30 percent had resided less than 1 year in the State. (See exhibit No. VII.)

II. PLAN OF ACTION

Conferences of interested parties were conducted, including representatives of the police department, sheriff's office, city attorney's office, chamber of commerce, railroads, county department of charities, and county and State relief agencies. The following plan of action was adopted, to wit:

1. To prevent the ingress of criminal type of transient by placing patrols at the border:
    a. All sheriffs in counties containing points of ingress by highway or rail were contacted. They promised to support the plan and deputize officers. These counties included Del Norte, Siskiyou, and Modoc; Lassen, Plumas, Nevada, and Inyo; San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial.
    b. Headquarters division of the Los Angeles Police Department was formed, consisting of 126 officers. The State was divided into areas—northern area included the first three counties named; central area included the next five counties named; and southern area included the last three counties named.
    c. Squads were placed near the border on each highway and railway entering the State.
        (1) Working under the authority of the statutes of California, to wit:
            (a) Section 836, paragraph 1, and section 837, paragraph 1 of the Penal Code, defining authority of arrest. (See exhibit No. VIII.)

---

[1] See also report by Mr. Davis on p. 3012.

(b) Section 587C of the Penal Code, defining evading payment of railroad fare. (See exhibit No. IX.)
(c) Section 647, paragraph 3 of the Penal Code, defining vagrancy. (See exhibit No. X.)
(d) The statutes of 1901, page 2005, section 12, defining the care of indigents. (See exhibit No. XI.)

NOTE.—Certain persons investigated were given their choice of returning to the place from whence they came or appearing before the local magistrate. Very few expressed the desire of appearing before the local magistrate.

III. RESULTS OF ACTION

1. From border activities:
   A. Many migratory criminals were kept out of the State. (See exhibit XII.)
   B. Forty-eight percent of the subjects fingerprinted were found to have previous records. (See exhibit No. XII–A.)
   C. Nation-wide publicity was secured as a result of the Department's action, which served as a great deterrent to the migration of criminals and indigents. It is difficult to estimate the number so deterred.
   D. It is proper to estimate that millions of dollars have been saved the taxpayers of the State of California and its political subdivisions in the prevention of the immigration of thousands of indigents.
2. From local activities:
   A. Vagrancy detail was increased.
   B. Thousands of arrests were made of vagrants, beggars, panhandlers, railroad-fare evaders within the city.
   C. The usual winter increase in crime has been prevented.
3. Contacts made in furtherance of the plan:
   A. Police departments in Los Angeles County.
   B. Sheriff's department of Los Angeles County.
   C. Major cities of the State.
   D. Police departments of the major cities of other Western States.
   E. Automobile clubs throughout the Nation.
4. Other results and conditions:
   A. Perfect harmony exists between our officers and the local law-enforcement agencies of the localities where our patrols are operating.
   B. The success of the entire plan has exceeded expectations.
   C. The plan is now openly supported by authorities throughout this State and in other States who were, at first, skeptical of the plan.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE ACTION

1. By State agencies or departments:
   A. Department of motor vehicles:
      (1) By use of checking stations now in operation, at points of ingress on highways.
      (2) Could be handled by personnel now on duty at checking stations.
      (3) Nine points of ingress of railways to be covered by other personnel. Some of these points could be covdred in conjunction with the highway detail.
   B. Board of equalization: (1) One of the duties of this board is the collection of taxes from caravans of cars entering the State. Checks on these caravans could best be made at the border and the men used in making these checks could be utilized in this plan.
   C. Agricultural department: (1) By use of plant-quarantine checking stations now in operation at the points of ingress of highways.
   D. Health department: (1) The establishment of State border quarantine stations for the examination of those having communicable diseases or coming from areas where epidemics are prevalent. The plant-quarantine stations could be utilized for this purpose.
   E. State relief administration: (1) Action in accordance with the police of this agency.
   F. Authorities of other States: (1) Could enter into compacts and agreements with the authorities of other Western States, and in this manner lighten the burden of each individual State.

2. By county agencies or departments:
    - A. Appropriation of funds by the board of supervisors of the concerned counties for additional deputy sheriffs.
    - B. Grants to the counties by the State of funds for additional sheriff personnel.
    - C. Sponsoring of Work Projects Administration projects for additional personnel, as in the instance of school-crossing guards.
3. By the railroads:
    - A. Utilization of available special agents.
    - B. Provision for additional special agents.
    - C. Maintenance of close cooperation with law-enforcement agencies.

TABLE IA.—*Total individuals under care as shown in 1 day census reports, 15th of each month*

	Total United States less California	California
1934		
February	111, 552	16, 998
March	129, 309	18, 771
April	146, 671	19, 908
May	169, 055	21, 139
June	170, 684	21, 604
July	191, 489	22, 523
August	205, 130	21, 974
September	212, 890	23, 321
October	223, 012	27, 108
1934—Continued		
November	251, 388	30, 858
December	271, 469	34, 761
1935		
January	276, 479	37, 977
February	274, 527	41, 441
March	274, 267	41, 474
April	265, 534	40, 530

Survey of transients coming into Los Angeles via various railroads Dec. 20, 1935, 8 a. m., to Dec. 22, 1935, 8 p. m.

	Adults	Juveniles	Total
Victorville	72	14	86
Colton	270	62	332
Los Angeles City Yards	91	7	98
Total	433	83	516

TABLE II.—*Vagrancy arrest bookings with previous records, Jan. 8, 1936, to Feb. 2, 1936, inclusive*

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician]

	Number of arrest bookings	Number with previous felony records	Percent with felony records	Number with misdemeanor records	Total with previous records	Percent with previous records
Total vagrancy	1, 270	308	24	295	603	48
Local makes	240					
Washington makes	363					
Total	603					


TOTAL INDIVIDUALS UNDER CARE
As shown in One-Day Census Reports, 15th of each Month
TOTAL U.S. LESS CALIF.
CALIFORNIA
FEB
MAR
APR
MAY
JUNE
JULY
AUG
SEP
OCT
NOV
DEC
JAN
FEB
MAR
APR
1934
1935
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. N.Y. NO. 358-83
Semi-Logarithmic, 4 Cycles 12 to the inch.


Chart Showing
Curves Of
SEASONAL TREND OF SPECIFIED CRIMES
OF
(BURGLARY - ROBBERY - AUTO THEFT)
AND
TOTAL OF ALL CRIMES
Committed
In The
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
FROM JULY 1933 TO JANUARY 1936 INCL.
3400
3200
3000
2800
2600
2400
2200
2000
1800
1600
1400
1200
1000
TOTAL OF ALL CRIMES
TOTAL SPECIFIED CRIMES
(BURG-ROBB-AUTO THEFT)
JUL
AUG
SEP
OCT
NOV
DEC
JAN
FEB
MAR
APR
MAY
JUN
JUL
AUG
SEP
OCT
NOV
DEC
JAN
FEB
MAR
APR
MAY
JUN
JUL
AUG
SEP
OCT
NOV
DEC
JAN
1933
1934
1935
1936

TABLE III.—*Seasonal trend of specified crimes committed in Los Angeles City July 1935 to February 1936, inclusive*

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician, Mar. 2, 1936]

	Burglary	Robbery	Auto theft	Total, major crimes	Total, all crimes
1933					
July	754	168	658	1,580	2,797
August	759	167	532	1,458	2,738
September	703	176	516	1,395	2,688
October	720	171	578	1,469	2,870
November	761	175	558	1,494	2,888
December	828	199	634	1,661	3,258
1934					
January	775	187	577	1,539	3,183
February	715	150	525	1,390	2,893
March	747	160	582	1,489	2,911
April	654	124	462	1,240	2,516
May	551	96	529	1,176	2,420
June	643	90	496	1,229	2,311
July	662	100	517	1,279	2,370
August	699	115	473	1,287	2,410
September	660	109	498	1,267	2,359
October	623	97	511	1,231	2,379
November	727	96	586	1,409	2,634
December	791	89	700	1,580	3,082
1935					
January	670	90	559	1,319	2,825
February	684	67	486	1,237	2,334
March	749	72	522	1,343	2,474
April	650	95	495	1,240	2,257
May	582	68	463	1,113	2,106
June	504	75	449	1,028	1,870
July	533	85	442	1,060	2,005
August	576	87	470	1,133	2,133
September	538	59	440	1,037	2,015
October	561	63	513	1,137	2,155
November	571	83	552	1,206	2,347
December	751	89	690	1,530	2,758
1936					
January	670	90	559	1,319	2,533

TABLE IV.—*Persons arrested by Los Angeles Police Department who were sentenced to state prison; also showing the number in Los Angeles County less than 1 year, Fiscal years 1930–31 to 1934–35, inclusive.*

	1930–31		1931–32				1932–33			1933–34			1934–35					
	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Total number sentenced to State prisons (5 years)	Total number in county less than 1 year (5 years)	Percentage in county less than 1 year (5 years)
Homicide	20	2	10	23	7	30	25	3	12	33	3	9	28	4	14	129	19	15
Rape	9	2	22	5	----	0	11	2	18	19	1	5	20	3	15	64	8	13
Robbery	204	71	35	184	63	34	178	54	30	199	43	22	83	24	29	848	255	30
Assault	17	2	12	6	2	33	18	2	11	24	2	8	17	1	6	82	9	11
Burglary	90	33	37	174	60	34	186	62	33	175	57	33	90	27	30	715	239	33
Forgery	68	25	37	98	28	29	68	18	28	106	26	25	60	14	23	400	111	28
Theft	90	25	28	146	38	26	180	37	21	195	40	21	133	26	20	744	166	22
Weapon act	8	3	38	7	1	14	2	1	50	12	3	25	4	----	0	33	8	24
Sex	6	2	33	20	2	10	11	----	0	44	14	32	36	4	11	117	22	19
State poison	13	----	0	21	3	14	33	4	12	49	7	14	35	6	17	151	20	13
Liquor	8	----	0	4	1	25	3	----	0	----	----	0	----	----	0	15	1	7
Drunk driving	3	----	0	4	----	0	1	----	0	2	----	0	2	----	0	12	----	0
Motor vehicle act	1	----	0	5	----	0	----	----	0	----	----	0	----	----	0	6	----	0
Others	10	3	30	33	3	9	17	6	35	40	9	23	17	1	6	117	22	19
Total	547	168	31	730	208	29	733	189	24	898	205	23	525	110	21	3,433	880	26

TABLE V.—*Persons arrested by Los Angeles Police Department who were sentenced to State prison; also showing the number in California less than 1 year, fiscal years 1930–31 to 1934–35, inclusive*

	1930–31			1931–32			1932–33			1933–34			1934–35			Total number sentenced to State prisons (5 years)	Total number in state less than 1 year (5 years	Percentage in State less than 1 year (5 years)
	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prisons	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year			
Homicide	20	2	10	23	7	30	25	1	4	33	2	6	28	3	11	129	15	12
Rape	9	1	11	5	----	0	11	2	18	19	----	0	20	1	5	64	4	6
Robbery	204	62	30	184	52	28	178	42	24	199	33	17	83	22	27	848	211	25
Assault	17	2	12	6	2	33	18	2	11	24	1	4	17	----	0	82	7	9
Burglary	90	27	30	174	47	27	186	47	25	175	48	27	90	22	24	715	191	27
Forgery	68	19	28	98	16	16	68	14	21	106	16	15	60	15	25	400	80	20
Theft	90	15	17	146	30	21	180	25	14	195	34	17	133	23	17	744	127	17
Weapon act	8	2	25	7	1	14	2	1	50	12	2	17	4	1	25	33	7	21
Sex	6	2	33	20	2	10	11	1	9	44	3	7	36	2	6	117	10	9
State poison	13	----	0	21	2	10	33	2	6	49	6	12	35	4	11	151	14	9
Liquor	8	----	0	4	1	25	3	----	0	----	----	0	----	----	0	15	1	7
Drunk driving	3	----	0	4	----	0	1	----	0	2	----	0	2	----	0	12	----	0
Motor vehicle act	1	----	0	5	----	0	----	----	0	----	----	0	----	----	0	6	----	0
Others	10	1	10	33	3	9	17	5	29	40	----	0	17	2	12	117	11	9
Total	547	133	24	730	163	22	733	142	19	898	145	16	525	95	18	3,433	678	20

TABLE VI.—*Arrests by Los Angeles Police Department in which the courts convicted and sentenced on the offense charged for the month of January 1936*

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician]

Offense	Number convicted	Number in county less than 1 year	Percent in county less than 1 year	Number in State less than 1 year	Percent in State less than 1 year
Homicide	3	----	0	----	0
Rape	4	----	0	----	0
Robbery	6	2	33	2	33
Assault	32	----	0	----	0
Burglary	16	4	25	2	13
Forgery	27	5	19	5	19
Theft	157	36	23	30	19
Concealed weapons	8	3	38	3	38
Sex	153	30	20	25	16
Nonsupport	2	----	0	----	0
State poison	33	5	15	4	12
State Liquor Control Act	13	1	8	1	8
Drunk driving	189	6	3	3	2
Drunk	4,684	347	7	272	6
Disorderly conduct	11	2	18	2	18
Vagrancy (except sex)	1,656	1,411	85	1,215	73
Motor Vehicle Act	10	----	0	----	0
Municipal ordinance	121	17	14	15	12
Others	233	21	9	18	8
Total	7,358	1,890	26	1,597	22

Subjects committed to State prison the past 5 fiscal years, Los Angeles County, March 2, 1936

Fiscal year	San Quentin	Folsom	Total
1930–31	698	182	880
1931–32	831	233	1,064
1932–33	772	214	986
1933–34	831	247	1,078
1934–35	566	195	761

The records indicate that during the fiscal year 1934–35, 761 subjects were committed from Los Angeles County and of this number 213 had resided less than 1 year in the county of Los Angeles, denoting a percentage of 28.

Penal Code section 836, paragraph 1:

Arrests by peace officers.—A peace officer may make an arrest in obedience to a warrant delivered to him, or may, without a warrant, arrest a person: 1. For a public offense committed or attempted in his presence.

Penal Code, section 837, paragraph 1:

Arrests by private citizens.—A private person may arrest another: 1. For a public offense committed or attempted in his presence.

Penal Code, section 587c:

Evading payment of railroad fares.—Every person who fraudulently evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of his fare while traveling upon any railroad shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment (1909:575).

Penal Code, section 647, paragraph 3:

Every person who roams about from place to place without any lawful business is a vagrant and is punishable by a fine of not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding 6 months or by both such fine and imprisonment (1931:696).

The statutes 1901, page 636, section 3, provides as follows:

"Every person, firm, or corporation. or the officers, agents, servants, or employees of any person, charitable organization, firm, or corporation, bringing into or leaving within, or procuring the bringing into or the leaving within, or aiding in the bringing into or leaving within, of any pauper, or poor, or indigent, or incapacitated, or incompetent person as hereinbefore mentioned, in any county or city and county in the State of California, wherein such person is not lawfully settled or not lawfully residing as herein defined, knowing him to be such pauper, poor, indigent, or incapacitated, or incompetent person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

The 1933 Statute provides as follows:

"Every person, firm, or corporation, or officer or agent thereof, bringing into or assisting in bringing into the State of California any indigent person as described in this act, who is not a resident of the State of California, knowing him to be an indigent person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

Foreign transient activities—Technical arrests made by Los Angeles Police Department

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician, Mar. 9, 1936]

	Evading railroad fare	Vagabond roamer	Others[1]	Total	Previous records	Percentage with previous records
Southern area:						
Winterhaven, Imperial Company	6	186	3	195	104	
Blythe, Riverside Company		119		119	26	
Cadiz, San Bernardino Company	37	1		38	28	
Wheaton, San Bernardino Company		6		6	4	
Kelso, San Bernardino Company	3	9		12	4	
Total southern area	46	321	3	370	166	45
Central area:						
Portola, Plumas Company		48		48	33	
Truckee, Nevada Company	14		1	15	11	
Bridgeport, Mono Company						
Bishop, Inyo Company	6	2		8	4	
Total central area	20	50	1	71	48	68
Northern area:						
Highway 101, Del Norte County		2		2		
Highway 199, Del Norte County		4		4	2	
Hornbrook, Siskiyou County	23	15	2	40	20	
Dorris, Siskiyou County	59			59	26	
Stronghold, Modoc County		7		7	5	
Tule Lake	7	7		14	5	
Total northern area	89	35	2	126	58	46
Grand total	155	406	6	567	272	48

Others include actual arrests such as burglary, murder, and auto theft.

Foreign transient activities, Los Angeles Police Department

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician, Mar. 9, 1936]

	Entered via railroad	Entered via highway	Total sent back	Leaving State voluntarily	Total leaving State
Southern area:					
Winterhaven, Imperial County	187	715	902	3, 601	4, 503
Blythe, Riverside County		171	171	89	260
Cadiz, San Bernardino County	75	4	79	116	195
Wheaton, San Bernardino County		6	6		6
Kelso, San Bernardino County	41		41	49	90
Total southern area	303	896	1, 199	3, 855	5, 054
Central area:					
Portola, Plumas County	44		44	113	157
Truckee, Nevada County	3	11	14	121	135
Bridgeport, Mono County					
Bishop, Inyo County	7	1	8		8
Total central area	54	12	66	234	300
Northern area:					
Highway 199, Del Norte County				17	17
Highway 101, Del Norte County		1	1	39	40
Hornbrook, Siskiyou County	19	15	34	261	295
Dorris, Siskiyou County	44	6	50	50	100
Stronghold, Modoc County, and Tule Lake	23		23	215	238
Total northern area	86	22	108	582	690
Total foreign transient activities	443	930	1, 373	4, 671	6, 044

NOTE.—Transients picked up locally by Los Angeles Police Department and deported out of State, 742

Foreign transient activities, Apr. 17, 1936

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician]

	Entered via railroad	Entered via highway	Total sent back	Leaving State voluntarily	Total leaving State
Southern area:					
Winterhaven, Imperial County	448	1, 239	1, 687	6, 828	8, 515
Blythe, Riverside County	6	192	198	282	480
Cadiz, San Bernardino County	162	4	166	206	372
Wheaton, San Bernardino County		8	8		8
Kelso, San Bernardino County	68		68	69	137
Total, southern area	684	1, 443	2, 127	7, 385	9, 512
Central area:					
Portola, Plumas County	57		57	343	400
Keddie, Plumas County	18		18	15	33
Truckee, Nevada County	20	11	31	381	412
Bridgeport, Mono County			0		
Bishop, Inyo County	7	1	8		8
Total, central area	102	12	114	739	853
Northern area:					
State Highway 199, Del Norte County				36	36
State Highway 101, Del Norte County		1	1	51	52
Hornbrook, Siskiyou County	56	23	79	779	858
Dorris, Siskiyou County	61	6	67	363	430
Stronghold and Tule Lake, Modoc County	91		91	508	599
Total, northern area	208	30	238	1, 737	1, 975
Total, foreign transient activities	994	1, 485	2, 479	9, 861	12, 340

NOTE.—Transients picked up locally by Los Angeles Police Department and deported out of State, 1,194

Foreign transient activities—technical arrests made, Apr. 17, 1936

[Los Angeles Police Department, office of statistician]

	Evading railroad fare	Vagabond roamer	Others [1]	Total	Previous records	Percentage with previous records
Southern area:						
Winterhaven, Imperial County	244	277	6	527	242	46
Blythe, Riverside County		150	2	152	30	20
Cadiz, San Bernardino County	82	1		83	56	67
Wheaton, San Bernardino County		8		8	6	75
Kelso, San Bernardino County	26	15		41	20	49
Total southern area	352	451	8	811	354	44
Central area:						
Keddie, Plumas County		25		25	16	64
Portola, Plumas County		59		59	42	71
Truckee, Nevada County	30	2	1	33	21	64
Bridgeport, Mono County						0
Bishop, Inyo County	6	2		8	4	50
Total central area	36	88	1	125	83	66
Northern area:						
Highway 101, Del Norte County		2		2		0
Highway 199, Del Norte County		8		8	6	75
Hornbrook, Siskiyou County	60	27	2	89	44	49
Dorris, Siskiyou County	119	1		120	55	46
Stronghold, Modoc County		16		16	9	56
Tule Lake, Modoc County	7	71		78	41	53
Total northern area	186	125	2	313	155	49
Grand total	575	663	11	1,249	592	47

[1] Others includes actual arrests such as burglary, murder, auto theft, and theft of mail.

Mr. ABBOTT. I wish to introduce a communication sent to Col. Wayne Allen, chief administrative officer by H. F. Scovill of the Bureau of Administrative Research of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., and attaching a letter by Fred R. Rauch, Assistant Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration addressed to Hon. Leland M. Ford, Member of Congress from the Sixteenth District of California.

(This material appears below:)

BUREAU OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESEARCH,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
February 16, 1940.

Order No. 3475.

To: Col. Wayne Allen.
Chief Administrative Officer.

Subject: Migrant Study—W. P. A. Comments.

The attached memorandum, requested in your letter of November 16, 1939, summarizes our analysis of the comments on the migrant situation contained in a letter from the assistant commissioner of the Works Progress Administration to Congressman Leland Ford. Two additional copies are enclosed for Congressman Ford, and his file is herewith returned.

Besides explaining the points particularly referred to by the Assistant Commissioner, this memorandum reports further findings and conclusions which are briefly summed up as follows:

(1) The influx of destitute migrants to California is continuing at an accelerated pace.

(2) Large numbers of irresponsible migrants are now coming to take advantage of California's liberal public relief.

(3) To some extent the efforts of governmental agencies to relieve the situation are tending to aggravate and perpetuate the problem.

(4) The migrations since 1933 are only forerunners of mass migrations on a larger scale as the result of Nation-wide land problems.

(5) None of the proposals so far advanced nor all of them in combination, will provide a permanent remedy.

Respectfully submitted.

H. F. Scovill, *Director.*

Order No. 3475, February 16, 1940

The following comments pertain to the problem of interstate migration as discussed in a letter, dated November 3, 1939, from Fred R. Rauch, assistant commissioner, Works Progress Administration, to Congressman Leland Ford. For convenient reference the remarks below follow the same context as the assistant commissioner's letter.

(1) THE NATIONAL PROBLEM WITH RESPECT TO URBAN INDUSTRIAL MIGRATION

The first four paragraphs assert certain principles relative to the national problem of transiency with which there can be no disagreement. It recognizes that the Pacific Southwest's migratory agricultural worker question, while an important part of the grave national transiency problem, is distinct from the urban industrial migrant issue. Attention is called to the danger of minimizing the greater part of the problem by concentrating consideration on the transient difficulties of the coast. However, to avoid the opposite danger of minimizing the serious consequences to the Pacific coast, and to California particularly, from the continued uncontrolled influx of distressed peoples, the following explanations and discussion are submitted.

(2) THE CALIFORNIA SITUATION

The letter suggests the possibility of duplication in the count of migrants coming to California.

Careful consideration of the circumstances impelling the vast migration to California, and of the economic status of the migrants after arrival, tends to dispel any feeling that great numbers would return to their previous States of residence and thence emigrate once again to California; or that the number of migrants remaining in California might be substantially exaggerated.

(*a*) Therefore, there could be little duplication in the count between out-of-State migrants and the "returning Californians," as suggested in the letter. The 65,471 migrants reported from Oklahoma (see table A of report No. 2, Oct. 2, 1939) constitute a portion of the 285,817 "out-of-State" migrants counted, exclusive of 54,442 "returning Californians" listed separately (p. 2 of table A).

(*b*) Most of the refugee agricultural migrants arriving in California are "relocation" migrants who have abandoned thought of returning to their home States. Their condition of destitution upon arrival evidences an imperative need for relief. Their earnings in a glutted agricultural labor market cannot provide more than bare subsistence. (See our report No. 1, June 27, 1939.) It is, therefore, difficult to conceive that any appreciable number could frequently make the arduous trip from California to and from the drought States from which they originate.

(*c*) As to the number of migrants remaining in California, a survey of the case load of the State relief administration, taken on February 11, 1939, revealed that 2.6 percent of the cases receiving aid had State residence of less than 1 year. Seven and seven-tenths percent had State residence between 1 and 2 years, and 6.9 percent between 2 and 3 years. Hence, 17.2 percent of the 108,636 cases aided in that month, or 18,707 employable cases, were without 3-year residence. To this figure should be added the number who are in Works Progress Administration employment or who obtain limited seasonal employment, as well as those who are unemployable. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the number remaining in California is large, particularly when certain other factors presented in the previous two studies are also considered.

(*d*) The large number of "returning Californians" can be explained as the result of the seasonal interstate migration of agricultural workers between California and adjoining States. The conclusions reached from the separate findings of various authorities who have studied this matter can be summarized as follows:

Some migrants to the Pacific Northwest have relocated successfully on farms. The majority of the refugees come to California and most of these become constant seasonal migrants. Many California migrants, and regular migratory casual workers, cross and recross to Arizona, Oregon, and Washington, which represent important areas of employment for migrant workers originating in California. As to Arizona, by which route nearly 60 percent of the migrants reach California, the migrant interplay is between the winter lettuce season in Imperial Valley, Calif.—later the spring lettuce harvest of the Salt River Valley of Arizona—then back to the early summer cantaloup harvest in Imperial Valley, and back once again to the fall cotton harvest of Salt River Valley, Casa Grande, and other parts of Arizona.

(*e*) Instead of the number of "returning Californians" tending to duplicate the count of "out-of-State" migrants, the contrary may be true. The tally of "returning Californians" may tend toward an underestimation of the number of migrants remaining in California from time to time.

Migrants arriving in California must acquire California license plates for their cars upon accepting gainful employment. (California Motor Vehicle Code, sec. 216). Also those who are in the State over 1 year but less than 3 years must carry California licenses.

A news article in the Los Angeles Daily Journal on January 31, 1940, quotes a statement of the local manager of the California Department of Motor Vehicles that registration of out-of-State cars is going on in Los Angeles at the rate of "600 per day and that there will be 30,000 out-of-State applicants handled." While all of these are not migrants in search of manual employment, it is reasonable to expect that a very large proportion of this large number are changing registration in accordance with law in order to accept employment. To the extent that these nonresident workers participate in the interstate seasonal migration, they are counted on each recrossing into California, as "returning Californians." Being thus counted contributes substantially to the "very large number of manual workers classified as 'returning Californians' " referred to in the letter. Their actual status, however, is that of "out of State" migrants.

(3) "WHAT MAY BE DONE TO HELP CALIFORNIA?"

In answer to the above query the assistant commissioner refers to, and partially quotes, a letter from Col. F. S. Harrington, administrator of the Work Projects Administration, addressed to the President, dated March 15, 1939. The letter summarizes the California problem and the proposals offered for its solution. The President concurred in the recommendations made by Administrator Harrington.

The summary is based upon a detailed report which was prepared by the Work Projects administrator in northern California after discussion with officials of the various governmental agencies most directly concerned with the problem. This detailed report explores the subject in all its phases. It offers constructive plans, the adoption of which holds hope for relieving the situation to a limited degree in both its immediate and long-range aspects. However, even the partial betterment to be expected from the suggested plans is dependent upon special legislation to be enacted by the Congress so as to broaden the powers of the group of Federal agencies which can cooperate in alleviating the conditions which prevail.

A careful reading of the detailed report above mentioned is necessary for a full comprehension of the scope and complications of the problem, and of the far-reaching measures that must be considered in attempting solution. For ready reference we have prepared and attached hereto a memo (exhibit A), giving some of the highlights on the more important points.

Despite the able analysis of the problem and the constructive approach to its solution, the dismal conclusion just be reached that no solution, or combination of proposed solutions so far offered is comprehensive enough. Far more intensive research is necessary if remedial treatments adequate for the serious social and economic malignancy which has been created and continues to aggravate the problem are to be developed.

(4) RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CALIFORNIA SITUATION

(*a*) The decrease in the number of "out of State" migrants arriving in California during the first quarter of 1939 was offset by later arrivals in increasing numbers. By the end of November the number arriving in 1939 had reached 62,311; the figure for the 11 months exceeding that for the whole year of 1938 by 6,473 persons.

(*b*) From articles appearing in the press in recent weeks, it is apparent that the anxiety over the migrant situation in California is increasing. The anxiety extends not only to the need for immediate action, but also to the pessimistic outlook for the future. For example:

1. The changing economic status of the cotton States brings a prediction made to the La Follette civil liberties committee recently by Prof. John B. Canning, of Stanford University, of a migration of Negroes from the eastern cotton States "much more terrible than that from the dust bowl."

2. Before the same committee, R. V. Jensen, vice president of Western Cotton Products Co., blamed the Nation-wide Federal crop acreage reduction for scattering agricultural workers; and creating huge agricultural surpluses in California and Arizona; also, the National Emergency Council and the Federal Farm Security Administration for the Federal Government's maintaining "throngs of cotton pickers in the State (California) from season to season on public relief."

3. Before the same committee W. V. Allen, Federal farm placement supervisor in Los Angeles County, testified: "All cotton pickers are prospective relief clients 10 days after the picking season is over."

4. In an Associated Press dispatch on February 11 the Russell Sage Foundation predicted "substantial mass migrations from four large areas in the United States (the cut-over region of the Great Lakes, the southern Appalachian coal plateau, the submarginal farm lands in the Great Plains and the old Cotton Belt) as a result of land problems. Estimates suggest a migration of from 1,500,000 to 6,000,000 from the old Cotton Belt alone."

5. In discussion of the Federal migration camps, ex-President Holmes Bishop, of the Associated Farmers (California) told the La Follette committee that "it is a problem to make decent provision for migrants without thereby attracting others on that very account * * * surplus of labor causes the work to be spread so thinly among the seasonal workers that many of them can no longer earn enough to carry them through the unemployment season."

6. In an address in San Francisco on October 27, 1939, the chief of the division of immigration and housing, asserted that migratory farm labor in California "creates a crushing relief load, with as much as 80 percent of the relief loads of rural counties being made up of agricultural workers."

7. The California State Chamber of Commerce considers the assimilation of migrants from the Dust Bowl States as "California's most pressing problem." Its State-wide agricultural committee observes that "only through the coordinating activities of the Federal Government can any permanently constructive steps be taken looking toward checking the migrant stream and what we need is action, now. The migrants are pouring in on us by the thousands."

8. The California State director of finance, and chairman of the Governor's commission on reemployment, stated, "They (relief costs) already have caused taxes to swell alarmingly. Under the present trend there is acute danger that taxes will skyrocket to a point where they will bleed the community white and endanger its very foundations."

9. Curtailment of the Work Projects Administration program (which in California resulted in reducing the Work Projects Administration case load from 123,631 cases in October 1938 to 74,254 cases in October 1939), has contributed directly to the acuteness by increasing the State relief burden, and by increasing competition for the little farm and other work that is available.

10. With the migrants taking the place of residents in seasonal agriculture the State relief burden is increased by forcing residents to go on State relief and preventing those who are on relief from obtaining employment which would result in removing them from the relief rolls.

In Orange County, for instance, State relief administration officials disclosed, on January 9, 1940, that 400 to 600 migrant workers and their families have located on one large ranch mainly to pick the pea crop, while recipients of State relief are unable to obtain work.

11. Numerous ardent books, articles, and pamphlets depicting the hard fortune of the migrants who have poured into California, have gained large circulation. They have incited a wide public consciousness of the problem, and created a great concern in the public mind, not only as to the economic ills in prospect for this State, but also as to the social implications of an overrun of families with lower standards and habits. Authoritative writers variously estimate the number of honest, work-loving folks of character at 60 to 85 percent of the migrants. However, they are almost unanimous in pointing out that an unusually large number are of the lower fringe—irresponsible, shiftless, and immune to bettering influence.

12. Reliable authorities in the past have been led to the opinion that the liberal relief policy of California was not a great factor in attracting migration. Current

opinion seems to place greater blame on this factor. Numerous recent articles tend to confirm the oft-repeated charge that hordes are coming to California to enjoy the benefits of liberal relief. While generous sympathy is expressed for the larger number genuinely seeking rehabilitation, the general trend of the findings is that the continuance of the trek is now largely influenced by the publicity which has been given to this State's liberality in relief matters.

13. Concern is becoming manifest also that "relief," intended to ameliorate the condition of the minor group in distress, is insidiously rolling up catastrophe for the whole State. Accusations are being made, some of them undoubtedly well-founded, that transients who are already in California, and on relief, are encouraging relatives in other States to come to California; that most of the irresponsible element among the migrants, dissipate the relief money in new automobiles, drink and non-essentials; that the convenience in obtaining cash dole, clothing and surplus commodities is encouraging indolence and improvident habits; that even the better class of workers who start out willing and eager to work, become spoiled and soft soon after going on relief, and cease to seek work; that idleness, enforced or voluntary is breeding inversive traits of character which can only result in increasing the menace to society from crime, epidemics, subversive acts, and other social dangers.

FINDINGS

The findings of this third analysis of the effect on California of the influx of distressed migrants can be summed up as follows:

(1) That the continued inpouring is bringing large numbers of people of the lower fringe of humanity whose presence greatly increases the already grave menace to California's institutions and society.

(2) The governmental relief measures intended to improve the condition of these peoples are tending to some extent, to perpetuate and aggravate the problem.

(3) That the national problem of interstate migration, related chiefly to urban industrial migration, holds promise of at least partial solution upon return of better times generally in industry. The continued influx of destitute agricultural workers however, offers only a discouraging prospect for the migrants themselves and an ominous outlook for the State of California and its citizens.

(4) That what can be done in California about interstate migration depends largely upon direct assistance from the Federal Government and indirect help from the States of origin.

(5) That any of the meritorious plans, or all in combination, which have been proposed up to the present time, evidence only superficial treatment of deep-rooted unhealthy social and economic conditions.

(6) The time-consuming legislation is involved in any actions to expand the powers of existing agencies to partially cope with either the immediate phase or the long-range aspect of the problem. During this delay the problem grows in intensity and difficulty of solution.

(7) That California faces aggravation of an already perilous social and economic problem unless practical means can be taken that will stem successfully the tide of immigration of disadvantaged farming peoples from other States.

Exhibit A

(1) "The problem * * * is the result of extremely complex social and economic factors."

(2) "Much of the interstate migration * * * results in successful economic adjustment, but the unsuccessful portion creates a particularly acute problem * * *"

(3) "All States contribute and all States receive interstate migrants, but some few 'destination' States, such as California, receive many more than they give * * * 'origin' States, such as Oklahoma, give many more than they receive."

(4) "Among governmental agencies there is unanimous agreement that the problem is national in nature and therefore requires consideration on a Nation-wide basis."

(5) "* * * it is difficult to see how an attempted solution in a particular State can be effective unless there is coordination of effort in all States—particularly in States with excessive out-migration—an attempt to deal solely with local conditions in California would greatly complicate the problem and in the long run do more injury than good."

(6) "There is also general agreement that the problem has both an immediate and a long-range aspect. The immediate problem is one of relieving the pressure on local relief rolls. * * * The long-range aspect is concerned both with the conditions in the States of origin which cause the uprooting * * * and with the most effective means of stabilizing and rehabilitating those who are already uprooted."

(7) "In both the immediate and the long-range aspect joint effort between the several governmental agencies * * * is essential. No agency, as now constituted, can solve so large a problem."

(8) The United States Employment Service is "in the best position to disseminate information on employment opportunities. * * * Immediate benefits would result from a systematic spreading of information among potential migrants in the States of origin as well as among migrants en route for the purpose of checking the continual oversupply of workers to California. * * * All regular channels of publicity should be used * * * hand bills, signs along the road, radio announcements and word-of-mouth advertising. * * * The United States Employment Service offers its full cooperation with State and Federal agencies in further improving the distribution of workers in accordance with job opportunities."

(9) The Farm Security Administration has been making efforts to settle rural migrants "on small plots of land in areas where seasonal farm labor is in demand * * * but because they lack authority to purchase land, any expansion of this type of activity is limited. * * * Were it possible for the Farm Security Administration to acquire lands * * * cooperation with the United States Employment Service and Works Progress Administration might provide a useful combination of part-time private of project employment with subsistence farming."

(10) "The Works Progress Administration is well aware of the fact that people are continuing to leave States where conditions are unfavorable * * * long-range planning is required. It is not believed that a satisfactory program of this nature can be formulated in time to help the immediate need for assistance in California."

(11) "An increase of 10,000 in California's Works Progress Administration quota would provide the most effective immediate action. This additional quota would help to relieve the State of some of the relief burden. * * *

(12) "The health problem created by migrants is closely related to their economic status. * * * The Social Security Board has suggested that since the United States Health Service and the Children's Bureau now make Federal grants to States for financing health activities, these services might be extended on a temporary basis in California for the assistance of migrants. * * * The Public Health Service officials feel that additional funds for public-health work among migrants could be used to good advantage."

(13) Under the general heading of relief discussion is had:

(*a*) Of the need of more adequate diet, particularly for the children of migrants;

(*b*) Of assisting migrants to return to their States of former residence; and

(*c*) A system of Federal grants-in-aid to States * * * to defray the cost of relief extended to nonresidents.

As to balanced diet, it is suggested that "beneficial results would certainly follow from close cooperation between Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Farm Security Administration and California State Relief Administration" for achieving a "better balance of commodity distribution * * * by one agency supplementing the distribution made by the other."

As to returning migrants to their States of former residence, it is pointed out that "No Federal agency has the authority to compel migrants to return against their will."

As to Federal grants-in-aid, the comments of the Social Security Board are summarized as follows:

"(1) If assistance to nonresidents is granted to California it would have to be granted to all States.

"(2) Resentment would be aroused by grants to nonresident aid unless provisions were also made for assistance to needy residents not cared for under existing programs.

"(3) Assistance for nonresidents without a general relief program would tend to encourage transiency.

"(4) For the reasons noted above the Social Security Board's statement concludes that 'It would seem desirable to establish a Federal program of assistance to nonresidents and other needy individuals and families for whom employment on public works projects financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government is not suitable or available.'

"(5) If such a program were established the following questions would require decision:

(*a*) The establishment of a fourth category of assistance administered by the Board.

(*b*) Funds for this purpose.

(*c*) Conditions for approval of State plans.

(*d*) Modification or elimination of State legal settlement requirements for assistance.

"(6) Any program for aid to nonresidents would involve cooperation on the part of a number of State and Federal agencies. As a result there is need for a continuing committee under the auspices of some agency to formulate plans for nonresident aid."

(14) "Bad housing facilities * * * are the rule where migrants congregate. * * * Low income and short stays make the migrant an unprofitable or undesirable tenant. * * * The United States Housing Authority calls attention to the fact that they do not, on their own account, undertake the construction and administration of low-rent housing. Local housing authorities * * * own and operate the housing projects with the United States Housing Authority making loans."

The Housing Authority "officials question whether dwellings constructed with their aid can be built to rent for the very small amounts which the migrant worker can afford from his low earnings * * *. The improvement of housing conditions through the cooperation of local communities and the United States Housing Authority would more probably come under the heading of long-range planning than under that of emergency action."

"The Farm Security Administration has (to date) 10 Farm Security Administration camps with permanent structures in California, capable of accommodating 1,720 families * * *. There is proposed for completion in California accommodations for 1,200 additional families. The small-home construction program of the Farm Security Administration has provided for 100 families in California so far and 200 additional homes are planned for the current year."

(15) "In general the housing program of the Federal Security Administration has been pushed as rapidly as funds and planning would permit but at the present time it is drastically limited by lack of authorization to expend funds for the purchase of land."

(16) "The possibility of participation by the Works Progress Administration in low-cost housing is restricted at the present time * * * except when the occupants are to be relief recipients * * * were the provision removed, cooperation with local, State, and Federal agencies in low cost housing construction might well provide a desirable field of activity * * * restricted to properties owned and operated by agencies of the Government."

(17) "Proper educational advantages for the children of migrant families is a serious problem in California * * * many children of migrant families are growing up without the advantages of an American education * * * the California delegation then expressed the hope that if a bill for Federal aid to education is passed special provisions will be included for grants in proportion to the number of nonresident children being educated at local expense.

(18) The Office of Education recognized that the problem of migrant school children is one of increasing seriousness but points out

(*a*) That the problem is not peculiar to California;

(*b*) That at the present time the Office of Education does not have any funds that can be allocated to the State for this purpose.

(19) "Long-range planning: What the various agencies concerned with the problem of interstate migration can do in California and elsewhere at the present time is limited by the fact that an effective solution requires planned action on a wider basis than one state or region. Agency officials agreed on the need for long range planning in order to make the best use of their several authorities * * * (and) that a continuing committee on this problem should be set up under the auspices of one of the participating agencies * * * (to) formulate the long-range planning that is so badly needed."

(20) Conclusion: "Agency officials are all aware that the present situation is not unique; that it is merely the current aspect of last year's and next year's problem. Existing agency activities cover parts of the problem and in continuing and coordinating these activities lies the most hopeful prospect of the solution."

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 3, 1939.

Hon. LELAND M. FORD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FORD: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 27, 1939, addressed to Col. F. C. Harrington, enclosing a copy of the analysis of the transient relief problem in Los Angeles County and California generally, made by Mr. H. F. Scoville.

It is generally recognized that the transient relief problem is more severe on the Pacific coast than elsewhere in the United States. Nevertheless, it is the opinion of this office that it is a mistake to underemphasize the national scope of the problem. Reference to the Work Projects Administration research monograph on Migrant Families cited by Mr. Scoville will show, for example, that nearly three-fourths of the depression migrant families at Federal Emergency Relief Administration transient bureaus (families having largely an urban-industrial background) had never touched the Pacific Coast States in their travels. In concentrating attention upon the transient problem on the coast, there is danger that the greater part of the problem will be minimized.

As a practical administrative consideration, it is further believed that this problem cannot be attacked on the basis of the distinction between migration that balances and migration that results in net population displacement. In practice it has been found that there is no relationship between a State's willingness to give assistance to transients and the number of needy nonresidents that it contributes to other States. In practical application, it appears that raising the question of the State of origin as a basis for determining responsibility for transient relief results in tabling the entire discussion of where responsibility can and should be placed.

The foregoing applies to the problem of transiency as considered in connection with the urban-industrial migrants in need of public assistance. Migratory agricultural workers, it is believed, present a different problem, and one that is confined primarily to California, Texas, the Southwest, and Pacific coast generally. In making provision through the Farm Security Administration for the needs of this group, Congress has, in effect, already recognized that California and Southwestern agriculture cannot operate without this supply of mobile workers, nor can it protect the workers against recurrent privation and want.

Incidentally, it would seem that Mr. Scoville's analysis of border-count figures over the past four years tends to exaggerate the number of migrants remaining in California at any given time. The 65,000 figure recorded for Oklahoma, for example, doubtless contains many workers who crossed the California border two or more times and were duplicated in the total count. That the number of duplications must have been large is suggested by the very large number of manual workers classified as "returning Californians."

In answer to your question, "What may be done to help California," may I quote from Colonel Harrington's letter to President Roosevelt on this subject, dated March 15, 1939:

"* * * If the responsibility for solving the problem of interstate migration is to be accepted by the Federal Government, it is my opinion that special legislation to this end would have to be enacted by the Congress. Such legislation should provide for Nation-wide planning and might take the form of authorizing action along the three following lines:

"(*a*) The resettlement of the migrants who are now in California and other destination States and who can become self-supporting there.

"(*b*) The return of those migrants who are willing to resume residence in their State of origin and giving assistance in establishing them there.

"(*c*) The resettlement of other migrants in those areas where employment suited to their abilities is most likely to be found.

"I believe that a decision as to whether such legislation should be enacted rests with the Congress.

"Passing to the action which can be taken by the Federal agencies under their present powers the representatives of all of them are in agreement that according special treatment to nonresidents that is not available to residents is bad practice and tends only to aggravate the problem of migration. This is certainly true so far as the Work Projects Administration is concerned. It would be possible for the Work Projects Administration to set up an earmarked quota for the employment of migrants in California and to develop a work program particularly for those migrants. I believe, however, that this is highly undesirable and recommend against it. On the other hand, a general increase in the Work Projects Administration quota for the State of California will not do anything constructive to solve the problem, and the extent to which such an increase can be made under present limitations as to funds would not in my judgment have any marked effect in alleviating the conditions which prevail."

Also of interest in this connection is the report on the general problem of interstate migration, prepared at the President's request in March of this year. This report was printed under extension of remarks by Congressman Alfred J. Elliott in the Congressional Record of March 30, 1939, beginning on page 5007.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. RAUCH,
Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. ABBOTT: I offer a report, The Fifth Migration, by Dr. George Gleason, dated December 1, 1937.

(The report referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and is reprinted below):

THE FIFTH MIGRATION

Report on the California migratory agricultural workers prepared by Dr. George Gleason, executive secretary, county committee for church and community cooperation, Los Angeles, Calif.

On March 2, 1939, the Los Angeles County Committee for Church and Community Cooperation, which was appointed by the Board of Supervisors in January 1937, asked its executive secretary to make a study of conditions among Migratory Agricultural Workers in California. The first report was presented to the committee on April 25, 1939. With the approval of the committee, 500 copies were published in June. The bulletin met with such an instant demand, that a new edition, entirely revised, has been prepared. This is now offered as study material for churches, schools, and other organizations in Los Angeles County.

Foreword: I have just returned from a five-day visit to the San Joaquin Valley. Compared with six months ago, the conditions of the Migrants are much better. On the farms, in the towns, and in primitive suburban subdivisions many families are establishing permanent homes. Churches, schools, employment bureaus, boards of health, and the large farm employers are improving their services to these needy people.

The problem, however, is by no means solved. The Governor's Commission on Re-employment estimates that there are still in the State 50,000 living in shack towns or roaming about in their jallopies.—George Gleason (October 2, 1939).

I. THE SERIOUS SITUATION AMONG THE WHITE MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN CALIFORNIA

1. *The fifth migration.*—California, since early in 1935, has received an influx of more than 250,000 migrant agricultural workers from the "dried out," "blown out," and "mechanized" farms of the "Dust Bowl" of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Mississippi, and Texas, and from the Cotton States farther east and south. These wretched people are a part of more than 1,000,000 migrant workers, not including nonworking members of their families, traveling America's highways in search of work in the harvest fields. As the average family contains 4.65 persons, the newcomers in California represent an addition of between 50,000 and 60,000 households to the population of the State. Labor camps in California, where five or more are employed, and where the employer provides camp facilities, are said to number 4,500, of which 1,000 are for loggers, miners, etc., and 3,500 for agricultural workers. All of these labor camps are under the supervision of the State Division of Immigration and Housing. There are also 3,500 auto camps, many of which shelter migratory families. A total of 145,000 live in these camps the year round. A vast Migrant Problem! (California Journal of Elementary Education, February 1939, p. 183).

The migrants in the United States are divided into two classes; the Habitual Migrants, who from choice or habit have been following the harvest of hops, onions, peas, potatoes, cotton, wheat, berries, fruit, beets, lettuce, and grapes; and the Removal Migrants, who have been forced by low prices, drought, and mechanization to seek a better life in another State. The latter are truly the dispossessed. They form the large part of the 250,000 to 300,000 people who desperately need help in California.

2. *Four previous migrations.*—In California these white Anglo-Americans are the fifth group of migratory laborers to create a problem in our communities. The Chinese, in large numbers, were brought in following the Gold Rush of 1849. They built the railroads and provided the cheap labor for mines and farms. Their immigration was cut off by law in 1888. Then followed three successive waves of cheap foreign labor. First the Japanese, whose immigration was checked in 1907 by the Gentlemen's Agreement, and finally stopped in 1924. Japanese were followed by the Mexicans. By 1920 there were 70,000 Japanese and 80,000 foreign-born Mexicans in California. Filipinos to the number of 31,000 were brought in between 1920–29. In the early 1930's, 80% of the migrant workers were Mexicans and Filipinos. Since 1934, due to the repatriation of many Mexicans and the cutting off of Filipino immigration, the complexion of the agricultural migrants has literally changed, so that 80–90% are now native white Americans. A few of these are single men, "hoboes," "fruit tramps," "transients," as they are sometimes called, a permanent group of wanderers; but most of them are newcomers of the family type with whom this study is concerned.

Orientals and Mexicans, accustomed at home to a lower standard of living, usually bettered their condition even in the rough, unsanitary camp life of the intermittent farm work. But now, with the presence in the State of a quarter of a million of migrant people whose culture is similar to our own, this Fifth Migration is presenting a problem which must be promptly faced and wisely solved.

3. *Who are the migrants in California?*—Are these people Riff-Raff? Prof. Taylor of Berkely replies: "After having seen hundreds of them all the way from Yuma to Marysville, I cannot subscribe to this view. These people are victims of dust storms, of drought which preceded the dust, of protracted depression which preceded the drought. 'It seems like God has forsaken us back there in Arkansas,' said a former farm owner at a San Luis Obispo pea-picker's camp. 'The cotton burned up,' is their common story. They are largely farmers who have been carrying on agriculture on the family pattern which has been so long regarded as the great source of stability in our nation. One of them, recently picking fruit with his family in the Sacramento Valley, told succinctly this story of his decline from a farmer to farm laborer: 1927—made $7,000 as a cotton farmer in Texas; 1928—broke even; 1929—went in the hole; 1930—deeper; 1931—lost everything; 1932—hit the road; 1935—serving the farmers of California as a 'fruit tramp' " (Dr. Paul S. Taylor in Synopsis of Migratory Labor Problems in California).

In a study of 6,655 case histories, the heads of the migrant households were found to be men in their best working years. Only 7% were fifty-five years of age or over. About one-half had lived for twenty years or longer in the states from which they came (release to morning papers of Thursday, April 20, 1939).

Mechanization of agriculture is also driving labor out of the midwest and south. In 1920 there were only nine thousand farm tractors in Texas. But in 1937 there were ninety-nine thousand—and each tractor displaced from one to five tenant families. There is one Alabama county that had eight farm tractors a few years ago. Last year there were two hundred sixty tractors in that county and each was estimated to have forced one and one-half to two families off the land (Migrant Farm Labor; The Problem and Ways of Meeting It, p. 3).

One Mississippi planter bought twenty-two tractors and thirteen cultivators. He then evicted one hundred thirty of his one hundred sixty sharecropper families (Fortune Magazine, p. 112). Some think that this fate will come to the majority of the South's 1,800,000 tenants.

Other influences have encouraged the trek to this state: In June 1939, I found cotton choppers in the Mississippi Delta receiving an average of seventy-five cents for a ten-hour day. Another observer writes: "W. P. A.'s California wage scale was forty to forty-five dollars a month; Oklahoma's thirty-two to forty-five dollars. Also, the Dust-Bowl victims were told, California's farm wages were twice those of the rest of the Southwest. And the Farm Security Administration would see that you got a start by housing you in one of its migratory-labor camps. The State Relief was liberal and old-age benefits high" (Saturday Evening Post, November 12, 1938, p. 40). After one year of residence the migrant may receive relief up to $16 per month (Fortune Magazine, p. 119).

In a camp where Anglo-Americans predominated, there were five former farm owners, ten farm renters, forty-eight farm laborers, one electrician, one carpenter, one mechanic, one drug clerk, one miner, one photo finisher, and two common laborers (They Starve That We May Eat, p. 13).

There is a group of "Okies" (Oklahomans), as they call themselves, in Sawtelle, near Los Angeles. A man who lives near them is "appalled at their lack of education" regards them as "morally upright" and as "potentially good citizens." Few are on relief. They have a monopoly of the dump-truck business. There is "a good bit of pride among them." "What they want is jobs."

The statement of Rex Thomson, Superintendent of charities in Los Angeles County, who has had wide experience with these migrants throughout the state, suggests one of the problems they create: "These people arrive in California in desperate need of manual employment and being ineligible to relief due to the lack of residence, are willing, in order to acquire the necessities of life, to accept employment on almost any terms and under almost any condition. As a result occupational vacancies are often filled with such newcomers instead of by resident able-bodied Californians who are on the relief rolls. This partly explains why the number of able-bodied indigents does not show any perceptible decrease."

The vastness of the nation-wide farm problem was stated by Dr. Will Alexander, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, on May 24, 1939: Approximately 3,000,000 farm families are existing today at unwholesomely low standards of living. Almost 2,000,000 rural families were on relief in 1935. It is also estimated that the normal requirements in farm production need 1,600,000 fewer workers than in 1929 while the annual increase in the working farm population is now about 445,000 persons.

Dr. Alexander adds that while this problem has existed in America for more than a century, rural relief for many decades was provided under the guise of free land. Any farmer could move to a new homestead in the west. This solution of their problem is no longer possible.

People who find living conditions bad in the farm colonies of California might remind themselves as Dr. Alexander states, that "in the South nearly one-fifth of the farm homes in 1934 did not even have an outdoor privy" (How the Farm Security Administration is Helping Needy Farm Families, pp. 1, 3, 4).

4. *Typical families.*—(1) A Family near Poplar: By a rural road near Poplar, on March 30th, 1939, I saw members of the Crowell family packing their belongings into a trailer. All winter the father, mother and six children had been living on the ground in a tent by the river. The father's aching teeth were preventing him from working. The State Relief Administration was now providing a house and dental treatment in the hope that this worker might be rehabilitated. The family had come from Oklahoma, driven out by the drought. "It just seems as if the climate back East has changed so that everything we had was blown away," said the tall, lank head of the family.

The Poplar area covers 600 square miles, thirty miles long by twenty miles wide. During the cotton harvest it was formerly full of squatters, many of them living like this family by the side of the road and without sanitary provisions. Drinking water often had to be bought and carried some distance. There are a few private camps where people may hire a tent lot, and where forty to one hundred families live under better conditions but with a minimum of sanitary provisions.

(2) A Family at Nipomo: Mrs. Webber, Director of the State Relief Administration at San Luis Obispo, said that between 2,000 and 3,000 families come to that area for the pea picking which lasts for six or eight weeks following April 10. Some of them live in contractors' camps. I visited one on the Nipomo Mesa. This is typical of a slightly improved method of treating these migrant families. The contractor, Mr. Brock, who operates this camp, told me that the State requires him to provide sanitary privies and adequate water supply, and to supervise the arrangement of tents, trailers, and living quarters. The workers bring their own tent, bedding, etc. The West family with which I talked came from Oklahoma. The mother, if dressed a little better and if a little cleaner, might have been a Los Angeles woman serving a church dinner. The father was an honest looking laborer. "What we want is work. When do you think the pea picking will begin?" he anxiously inquired. "I am afraid the crop won't be ready for ten days. We are nearly out of money." The older boy of eighteen was a fine looking, clear-eyed, strong fellow. He said he had finished the seventh grade at school. There were also a boy of sixteen and a little girl of preschool age. A son of twenty had recently died of pneumonia.

In their tent, which was pitched on the dusty ground without a floor, were two double beds, an oil stove for cooking, and a table with some food on it. They possessed a baggage trailer on which they carried their goods from place to place. They had recently come from the pea harvest at Calipatria in the Imperial Valley.

The man was previously a tenant farmer in Oklahoma. Later he worked for the Shell Oil Refinery which closed down. The dust storm had spoiled the harvest. There was no work to be obtained. They fled to California. They believe that they are better off here than in their home state but they see no way of getting a start up the ladder. "We spend," the mother said, "all the income we make working on one crop in getting to the next job. It often is a week or ten days after arrival before work begins. The month and sometimes two months between jobs eats up all we make. How can we get ahead?"

(3) Families in distress, as described by John Steinbeck: "About the fifteenth of January the dead time steps in. There is no work. First the gasoline gives out, and without gasoline a man cannot go to a job even if he could get one. Then the food goes. And then the rains. With insufficient food, the children develop colds because the ground in the tents is wet. I talked to a man last week who lost two children in ten days with pneumonia. His face was hard and fierce and he didn't talk much. I talked to a girl with a baby and offered her a cigarette. She took two puffs and vomited in the street. She was ashamed. She shouldn't have tried to smoke, she said, for she hadn't eaten for two days. I heard a man whimpering that the baby was sucking but nothing came out of the breast. I heard a man explain very shyly that his little girl couldn't go to school because she was too weak to walk to the school and, besides, the school lunches of the other children made her unhappy. I heard a man tell in a monotone how he couldn't get a doctor while his oldest boy died of pneumonia but that a doctor came right away after he was dead. It is easier to get a doctor to look at a corpse than it is to get one for a live person. It is easy to get a body buried. A truck comes right out to take it away. The state is much more interested in how you die than in how you live. The man who was telling about it had just found that out. He didn't want to believe it" (*Their Blood is Strong*, p. 33).

Five years ago another family had fifty acres of land and a thousand dollars in the bank. The wife belonged to a sewing circle and the man was a member of the Grange. They raised chickens, pigs, pigeons and vegetables and fruit for their own use; and their land produced the tall corn of the Middle West. Now they have nothing (*Their Blood is Strong*, p. 6).

5. *A local situation.*—At Salinas I called on Fred S. McCargar, efficient secretary of the Chamber of Commerce. In thirty minutes he assembled twelve interested people with whom I had an hour's conference. They included several committee members of the Chamber, the County Welfare Director, a representative of the State Employment Bureau, the Director of the State Relief Administration, the Sheriff and the Chief of Police. These twelve men and women illustrated the three attitudes toward the migrants: (1) These people are undesirables with slovenly habits of living: let's get rid of them as quickly as possible. (2) They are a good class of farm laborers; let's turn them into a California asset. (3) They are here to stay; let us treat them as best we can, but do everything possible to stop their further influx. The general sentiment of this group seemed to be that there is a large surplus of laborers in the Salinas district. The health situation in that area has been improved by an ordinance prohibiting camping by the side of the road. It was stated that "ranchers have done a swell job of housing their workers."

6. *Economic conditions.*—One migrant worker who had been following the pea harvest and had earned $65 between February 15th and June 1st, remarked: "You can't make a living anymore; all you can do is live on what you make."

"The ordinary pea or lettuce picker is fortunate if he earns two dollars for a full day's work. He is indeed fortunate if he earns two hundred dollars a year, out of which he must take the cost of gasoline and upkeep of his car" (Msgr. O'Grady).

A well-filled year might include picking peas in Imperial Valley in February and March, at Nipomo on the central coast in April, and in Alameda County or Yolo County in June, and in Santa Clara County in July; scattered fruit jobs during the summer; grapes in Fresno County in August and September; cotton in Kern County in October, November and December; peas in Imperial Valley in November and December, and awaiting the maturity of the next crop in February. Then begins the 1,200 to 1,500 mile trek over again (from *Patters of Agricultural Labor Migration within California*).

Many more circulate in a smaller area, with Bakersfield, Fresno, or Stockton as a center. A few go to Washington for the short apple picking season. When sickness, floods or crop curtailment upset the schedule, families at once require relief. A family maximum income of $450 provides nothing for emergencies.

The State Agricultural Department allows the contractors to bring to a district one harvester for each acre of peas. In this way, an effort is made to keep up wages and prevent a great over-supply of workers in any one area. Mr. Brook, the contractor, said he planned "to take this whole group to a similar camp in Sacramento when the harvest in the Nipomo section had been finished." He collaborates with the State Employment Bureau. He makes his profit by receiving from the growers a commission on each hamper of peas picked. He pays the laborers thirty cents a hamper, the price having been raised from twenty-five cents as a result of a strike some time ago.

"Over a valley which is a man-made paradise spreads an army of destitution, with an abundant life just beyond its reach" (Saturday Evening Post).

"It is a disgrace to any civilization to find so many families with children of all ages living in roadside camps" (Msgr. O'Grady).

"On the Pacific Coast more than forty rural strikes have occurred since December, 1932; sometimes two or three have been in progress simultaneously" (They Starve That We May Eat, p. 29).

"Of thirty-seven agricultural strikes which took place in California in 1933, at least twenty-nine resulted in pay increases for the workers" (Survey Graphic, September, 1939).

This study of the Migrants does not attempt to analyze the perennial problem of the employer-employee conflicts on California farms. Literature on this subject is listed in the Bibliography. Note especially articles in Fortune Magazine and in the Survey Graphic and the Report of the Simon J. Lubin Society.

7. *Educational conditions.*—It is estimated that there are more than thirty thousand children of school age in the families of these migrants (California Journal of Elementary Education, February 1939). Their intellectual capacity seems to be quite up to the average. In two instances I learned of children who were at the top in their school work. In one very poor family which I visited near Poplar there was a girl of about fourteen years of age. Although living in wretched conditions this girl was the leading student in the school in that section. She was obviously ashamed of her home conditions and tried to hide when Mr. Hovey and I visited the family. There was only one chair in the cabin.

Due to constant moving about, however, the children on the average are retarded from one to one and a half years in their school grades. In the city of Bakersfield with an enrollment of 4,800 there were records of 1,000 transient children during the year 1937–1938, who enrolled, left and did not return.

A comparative study of 1,500 permanent and 500 nonpermanent pupils made by B. H. Apperson, of the Bakersfield City Schools, showed that in intelligence there was no marked difference, but that in classroom achievement the nonpermanent group was retarded an average of a little over a year. Another study revealed that in age, the nonpermanent group averaged only about one year older than others of the same grade. Similar studies by the Kern County Schools substantiated in general the above findings.

Lawrence E. Chenoweth, Superintendent of the Bakersfield City Schools, finds that although parents are on the whole cooperative "a spirit of defeatism is being built up among these children who move from school to school. They do not remain long enough to complete any project. This has a baneful influence upon stability of work in later life."

After seeing the school busses drive up to one of the camps and learning of the special school opened at another camp, and from correspondence, I gathered the impression that the school systems are making a heroic effort to meet the educational needs of the children. Education is not the chief problem.

8. *Moral conditions.*—As might be expected reports on moral conditions are conflicting. "I am convinced that these children have as many innate good qualities and potential possibilities as are to be found in the children of permanent community residents. They are sinned against rather than sinning" (L. E. Chenoweth, Bakersfield, for twenty-five years in the County and City Schools).

"The law enforcement officers in another district estimated that 95% of juvenile delinquency comes from the migrants." "Our records indicate that about 60% of the children who come before the Probation Officers and Juvenile Court of this County have been in the State less than two years" (C. M. Johnson, Chief Probation Officer, Kern County).

"Young people seem to rebel against this Gypsy style of life. They run away and sooner or later drift into trouble. Some sad cases of young people who have no desire to go wrong have been brought to my attention. The problems of migrancy are real ones" (L. C. McDonald, Y. M. C. A. Secretary, Stanislaus County).

There is more or less gambling and drinking among the men, partly due to lack of law enforcement. A relief worker stated that among these people there are many who back East were regarded as poor white trash. The tendency now is for those who come in to be of a lower and lower type. About one-tenth of them are on relief, was the estimate. Occasionally a slacker will bring his family to a harvest section some weeks in advance of the ripening crop. He then obtains relief and as soon as the work is ready he starts off to another field and arrives in time for a few weeks of relief there. This seems to be one of the problems the Relief Workers must cope with.

Many of the adult offenses and much of the sickness seem to be the result of conditions existing before these immigrants entered the State.

The general sentiment, however, seems to be that the children of these migrants on the whole have developed less delinquency than would be expected. If they can be settled and attend school regularly, they will probably not add to the crime of the State. Rev. Grover Ralston of Bakersfield and Rev. Byron P. Hovey of Poplar both spoke in high terms of the general good behavior, orderliness, and appreciation of the children they have known. At school and at meetings, "they seldom do anything out of the way." When helped "they are more appreciative than our natives." "They are courteous," and "their parents, as far as able, wish to pay as they go."

9. *Religious conditions.*—"They are highly emotional in religion, although they are not in other ways. We do not talk their language" (Rev. Grover Ralston, Bakersfield).

"Emotional type and then some! They do NOT fit into our present California churches other than those of their type. Consequently our churches are not able to give them very much religious guidance. When clothes, food, and other material aids stop, then these people stop, as far as our churches are concerned. Have had personal experiences of this sort" (Rev. E. M. Keller, Fresno.)

Rev. Byron P. Hovey and some of the camp managers reported that the Pentecostal Church and other conservative, emotional sects are rapidly developing their activities and meeting with considerable success. In some sections, however, a reaction against the more emotional leaders has set in, and they have been forced by the migrants themselves to leave the community.

At Shafter I visited on Sunday morning a church over which was the sign "Pentecostal Gospel Mission Old Time Revival." The Pastor, Mrs. Edwards, I had seen preaching on the street the night before. She was neatly dressed, played a guitar on the street, and at the church was playing a xylophone. Mrs. Edwards reminded me a little of Mrs. McPherson of Los Angeles.

At the Sunday morning service, besides the two instruments mentioned, there was a piano, a snare drum, a guitar, and a tambourine. The singing was with great zest and seemed to bring great satisfaction to the members present.

On the wall was the motto: "Trust in God, Magnify the Blood and Honor the Holy Ghost." In the song book used was a title "There is no Depression in Heaven." As the singing started the invitation was given: "Come up on the platform, help us sing and help us shout: Glory to God." The man presiding, who also played the tambourine, constantly remarked "Amen to God. Hallelujah."

The children had a special song:

> "The best way to have a revival
> Is to pray and to study your Bible.
> Put your feelings on the shelf,
> Treat your neighbor as yourself;
> That's the best way to have a revival."

The Church runs a "Gospel Bus" to pick up people for the meetings.

Mrs. Edwards told me that she and her husband started the church eight years ago. They built up eight branches in California. As he died last June she is planning to move her group into the "Assembly of God" Sect of the Pentecostal group. She thinks there are one hundred different denominations or groups of Pentecostal Churches.

The visiting Evangelists, who help in the revivals, receive the collection on Saturday nights. "They give me" said Mrs. Edwards, "a very nice collection on Sunday nights." This is the only salary Mr. and Mrs. Edwards have received. She added that their theology is the same as that of Mrs. McPherson in Los Angeles.

On another street in Shafter, I found the "Pentecostal Church of God," which had split off from the Edwards Church through the influence of a visiting Evangelist. "They wanted to run things in their own way was the cause."

10. *The situation summarized.*—(1) The State needs Migrant Workers: "California produces nearly one-half of the nation's fresh fruit, nearly all of its dried fruit and 70% of its canned food. We now harvest one-third of the nation's truck crop" (Erich H. Thompson, Regional Sociologist, United States Department of Agriculture.) One-third of the large-scale farms in the United States are in California (Fortune Magazine April 1939, p. 114). There are two hundred and thirteen commercial crops in California. To raise and harvest these crops about fifty thousand workers are needed all the time, and an extra 150,000 at the peak of the harvest.

(2) Is there an Excess of Migrant Workers in the State? There is considerable confusion of opinion regarding the excess of laborers. Rev. Wendell Kramer of Sanger, in the center of the grape district, says that in the fall of 1938, he was unable to find a woman to take care of his motherless children. Every available person was out in the fields. Women unable to work in the vineyards were caring for children in the home. For two months Mr. Kramer had to do his own housework.

Mr. Hardy, Superintendent of the Federal Camp at Farmersville, said that as far as his experience indicates, all the migrants are employed at the peak of harvesting in the summer.

The facts seem to show that the 250,000 recent arrivals in the State find abundant work and are a distinct asset to agriculture during the summer and early fall, but that many of them are a burden to themselves and to the State, during several months of the year. Public Welfare is said to require 50% of the taxes of the Counties of California (Charles I. Schottland).

(3) Is the immigration continuing? From mid-1935 to January 1, 1939 the plant-quarantine stations at the State's borders counted 285,000 refugees "in need of manual employment," besides 59,000 returning to California.

The Farm Security Administration, however, indicates that the "individuals entering California in automobiles in search of manual employment" are decreasing in numbers. Such Out-State entrants were 84,833 in 1936; 90,761 in 1937; and 67,560 in 1938. The January entrants decreased from 8,724 in 1938 to 3,792 in 1939. In the same years the February decrease was from 7,583 to 2,840. Also in the four months of greatest flow, July to October, the totals were respectively: 1936—40,000; 1937—32,000; 1938—18,000.

Ray Mork, Director of the Federal Camps at Shafter and Arvin, and others consulted in October, 1939, believe that the number of new entrants to the State is comparatively few. Some migrants, however, report that they have come to California recently because they were discharged from W. P. A. work in other States.

(4) The problem California must solve: These white workers from the midwest are here to stay. Immigrants interviewed, nearly all believe there is more opportunity in California than in their home states. Those who are repatriated frequently return to the coast as soon as they can fill their gasoline tanks. "There ain't any crops to harvest back in Oklahoma," was the usual remark.

The problem, then, is: The present organization of agriculture in California requires at the harvest peak, a large body of mobile workers. These workers are now largely our own American white fellow countrymen. What are we going to do to assimilate them, to relieve their present wretched economic condition, and at the same time, to continue to develop the resources of the State?

II. MEASURES BEING TAKEN TO RELIEVE THE SITUATION

Up to the spring of 1939, opportunities for these white migrant families to establish themselves decently and constructively in the life of the State, had been woefully inadequate. Progress, however, has been made.

1. *Federal migratory labor camps.*—Two migratory labor camps were established in California, in heavy work areas, by the Resettlement Administration in 1936. In 1937 the extension of the work was halted. In 1938 it was again taken up, and new camps were opened. There are now ten Federal Camps for employable farm workers, operated by the Farm Security Administration, at Brawley, Indio, Gridley, Arvin, Shafter, Farmersville, Santa Rosa, Wesley, and Winters. A new camp is being built at Firebaugh. There are also a few county, private and contractor's camps supervised by the Immigration and Housing Commission.

I visited three of the ten Federal Camps in California—Arvin, Shafter and Farmersville (near Visalia). These camps are well supervised and accommodate from 200 to 300 families each. Those that I visited have been built within two years and are gradually enlarging. They provide board or cement floors for tents or shacks furnished by the migrants. At Farmersville there are permanent one room metal cabins. The Government has been criticized for building one room cabins for families in which there may be even adolescent children. There is a central building where incinerators, toilets, showers, and washing machines are available. People can live in comparative self-respect in these camps. They meet primarily the needs of the first year immigrants who are ineligible for State Relief. The residents form a camp council where camp life is regulated on a more or less democratic basis. A meeting and recreation hall, a library, and a small clinic with a nurse are provided. A nursery is available for the small children. There is a camp school to which teachers are sent by the district, or school children are taken in busses to the nearest school. Each family pays ten cents a day into a fund which is used by the Council for camp activities.

Each of the camps visited and three other camps are experimenting with a "Farm Security Home Settlement Project," where a family is given a cabin and three-fifths of an acre with water for a private little farm. The monthly rent is $8.20 per family. There is a sanitary center for baths, laundry, etc. Accommodations for 172 families are available. Those who can pay for this privilege are able to better their conditions by having a home base from which they can go out to seek employment. After residence in the State for a year or more the people are encouraged to go out to private camps or subdivisions.

The capacity of the Federal Camps is 2,892 families, with plans for expansion up to 4,500. An experiment has also been made with a mobile camp moving about in Beaumont, Hemet, and Imperial Valley.

There is a primitive county migrants camp two miles south of Shafter, accommodating two hundred fifty families. During the winter months when there is little harvesting work, this place is crowded. Ground for trailers or tent space without flooring is provided. There are privies and meager bathing and laundry facilities. In the summer of 1939 ten college age young people, representing the Friends Service Committee, shared the heat, flies and discomforts of this camp and built a 30 by 60 community hall. A recreation program in this building, with W. P. A. leadership is being sponsored by the Ministerial Association of Kern County. A Thursday evening religious program is also being carried on by this Ministerial Group.

The W. P. A. is establishing a recreation unit to work among migrants. There are eighteen of these workers in the Federal Camp at Farmersville and four at the Poplar Community Center. They also do work at Porterville, Exeter, Visalia, Dinuba and Hanford. There is a training school for these recreation leaders. Mr. Loop, in charge of the work at the Farmersville camp, seems to be doing an excellent job.

The weekly schedule at the Shafter Federal Camp is as follows:

Sunday, Church and Sunday School.
Monday, Church and Camp Council.
Tuesday, Young People's Meeting Night—Social and Business.
Wednesday, Dancing.
Thursday, Amateur Night.
Friday, Boxing.
Saturday, Talking Pictures.

There are facilities in the camp for baseball, volley ball, horseshoes, croquet, and other games.

The inhabitants of the Federal Camp are no picked group. They are typical of the new migrants. They come from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and the other drought states. Eighty-five percent of them are former farm owners, farm renters, or farm laborers. The remaining fifteen percent includes painters, mechanics, electricians, and even professional men (*Their Blood is Strong*, p. 17).

2. *The national program of the Farm Security Administration.*—Since its origin as the Resettlement Administration in July 1935, the Farm Security Administration, as it is now called, has made rehabilitation loans to 650,000 farm families in the several states, and during this fiscal year plans to add 150,000 more to its rolls. As a measure of its success, it estimates that the average increase in net worth among the 650,000 families has been $252 and that the rehabilitation loans made will be at least 80 percent self-liquidating. The part of FSA's rehabilitation program that is directed toward a real solution of the migrant problem is not,

however, to be seen among the migrants in California. It is to be seen at the sources of migration.

According to the 1930 census 1,700,000 United States farm families have gross farm incomes of $600 or less a year. On the border line of survival, they could be overturned readily by an act of God or the market. They are therefore potential migrants. Dr. Will Alexander, the FSA's Administrator, estimates, however, that a million of these families can be successfully rehabilitated either on new land or by using their own land to better advantage. As an example of "better advantage" he offers the case of the 7,000 farm families included in FSA's program for South Carolina. When work began, these people were mostly tenants and croppers engaged in one-crop agriculture. Their average net worth was about $33. But what is to happen to the remaining 700,000 families?

3. *The Farm Security Administration's low-cost medical program.*—The Agricultural Workers' Health and Medical Association was organized in the spring of 1938, through cooperation of the Farm Security Administration, the California Medical Association, the State Board of Health and the State Relief Administration.

The Farm Security Administration provided capital of $100,000 to set the Agricultural Workers' Health and Medical Association in motion. To be at all effective in answering the needs of California's agricultural workers a medical organization must be designed to migrate with the migrants—that is, to move its services throughout the state to points where harvest workers are concentrated at any particular time. Since April 1938, district headquarters have been organized (and some subsequently closed as need for them waned) in the counties of Fresno, Merced, San Joaquin, Tulare, Imperial, Yolo, Yuba, Madera, Santa Clara, Sonoma and Kern. The association has had from the beginning several hundred physicians and numerous hospitals and drugstores at its service.

Every recipient of medical aid, according to the terms of his contract with the Association, is expected to pay for all treatment received "If so requested." It is unlikely that existing economic disabilities of the migratory laborers will permit repayment in many cases, at least at the present time. Consequently requests for payment will doubtless be few. Yet it is a fact that some members of the health cooperative have already made payments for its services immediately after having earned a few extra dollars. Increase of health service is greatly needed, because the state law prevents counties from giving health rehabilitation to those who have not had three years independent self-supporting residence in the state, except in cases of emergency or of prospective motherhood.

4. *Other health measures.*—During the five years prior to 1938, the population of Kern County increased 44% to 130,000. Cotton acreage increased 250% during this same period. The County Health workers and other public officials have made a heroic fight to improve living conditions among the migrants. While in 1937 it was estimated that 3,881 families were living in "Squatter Camps" by the side of highways, irrigation ditches, and in unused plots, in 1938 most of the migrants were in somewhat improved ranchers' shacks, or in supervised, though primitive, auto camps.

At the Kern county General Hospital I interviewed C. F. Baughman, County Health officer, Henry Beye, Statistician; and Richard Foraker, Director of Public Health Education.

The amount of service given by the County to the migrants is amazing. In the past year the number of nonresident out-patients treated at the Clinic was 4,872, while the number of nonresidents admitted to the Hospital was 2,499, all for free service.

In the year ending June 1939, of 3,000 births in Kern County 727 were from the Dust Bowl group of "physical farm laborers." Of these 727 babies, 544 or 75% were born in the County Hospital. Only forty-three births were delivered without benefit of physicians, of which more than thirty are believed to be in Mexican families. Only 25% of native California mothers avail themselves at child birth of the General Hospital, while 75% of mothers from the Dust Bowl region made use of the Hospital for child delivery.

In the first six months of 1937 the cost of treatment of nonresident patients, borne by the County was $55,000.

The improvement in sanitation and housing in Kern County is indicated by the reduction in the infantry motrality rate from one hundred eight per thousand live births in 1937 to sixty-seven in 1938. In 1939 there is indication of a further improvement.

5. *Housing on the ranches.*—(1) The Tagus Ranch: Six miles north of Tulare on Route 99 is the famous Tagus Ranch owned and operated by H. C. Merritt Jr. I met Mr. Merritt, his manager, L. O. Basteen, and Ray Edwards, of the personnel department. I was courteously driven about the Ranch by E. P. Haupt, assistant superintendent.

The Ranch, starting in 1916, now controls seven thousand acres, of which 4,500 are under cultivation. The chief products are apricots, peaches, and other fruits, alfalfa and cotton.

At the peak of employment 1,030 laborers were employed this year. Of these two hundred fifty are transients, who live in a tent village for about a month and half twice a year. The remaining workers come from 345 families who live in fairly comfortable cabins in eleven settlements scattered about the Ranch, or commute from their permanent homes in nearby towns.

Most of the cabins contain two or three rooms. One dollar per month rent is charged for each room. Light is purchased by each family from the Edison Company. Many families use Coleman lamps.

Mr. Merritt occasionally offers a prize of $2.50 for the best vegetable garden in each of the eleven camps and a similar prize for the best flower garden. One of his Mexican families has been on the Ranch for more than twenty years. His comfortable cabin is surrounded by a lawn and a flower and vegetable garden. Men are continuously employed to keep the cabins in repair and to supervise the sanitation of the camps.

The system of giving out brass checks and of conducting the company store has been frequently criticized. While the prices in the store seemed higher than in Los Angeles, the system of brass checks has been adopted as the most convenient way for advancing groceries and other supplies to the men who could not wait for pay day. Wages are paid by check at one window and cashed in regular money at an adjoining window. Brass checks, if any remain, can be exchanged on pay days for regular cash. Wages may be spent at the Company store or at Tulare six miles away.

(2) California Cotton Oil Co.: I visited the Cantua Creek Ranch of this Company, located forty-two miles southwest of Fresno. Ray Yearout, camp foreman, and his enthusiastic young wife took me over this interesting new ranch, which has been developed from the dry plains during the last two years.

This ranch, which is far from any other settlement, provides one hundred cabins for the six hundred fifty persons who live there during the harvest peak. Twenty-five permanent families divided equally between whites and Mexicans are employed for driving of tractors, for irrigation, and other regular work. A tractor driver receives $3.50 a day and an irrigator $2.75. They work seven days a week and are laid off for rain or other causes only about two weeks per year. There is no rent for the cabins, water is free, but each family pays 75 cents per month for light.

Gardens and water are available for the people who want them. I was told that some of the people from Texas and Oklahoma are saving money, hoping to return to their own homes.

The cabins are all of two rooms, with water outside. There are crude central showerbaths and plenty of privy toilets. There is a Company grocery store where the prices are said to be about the same as those in a small town. The ranch raises barley, flax, corn, sudan grass, and cotton.

The expense of starting such a ranch is indicated by the fact that a single well costs $12,000. There are seven wells on the place and the electric bill is $2,500 a month. The ranch contains seven thousand acres, of which 5,600 are under cultivation.

(3) Earl Fruit Corporation: With Rev. Clarence R. Wagner, of Delano, I visited the Sierra Vista Ranch, operated by the above-mentioned nation-wide corporation, of which the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation is a subsidiary. Mr. Di Giorgio has a reputation of paying good wages and treating his employees well. I met Roy Boone, manager, and R. L. Meyer, General Foreman. This ranch contains six thousand acres and employs at the peak 2,200, and four hundred in the slack season.

The permanent employees live in seventy-five homes, many of which are made of old solid boxcars with lean-to kitchens and sometimes other additions. The number of permanent cabins is gradually increasing. A charge of $3.00 per month is made for rent. Each resident also pays for his electricity. A large number of Filipinos live in a very crude dormitory and employ a member of their own group to feed them for 65 cents a day. Single white men live in a large upstairs dormitory, below which is their dining hall and playroom where they are fed by the company for 85 cents a day. Many of the women and other workers in the grape packing plant come from neighboring towns. Thirty cents an hour is paid for grape pickers, who average nine or ten hours' work per day.

The ranch raises grapes, lettuce, and asparagus. Work on the last two crops comes when grape pruning and harvesting are inactive.

(4) Rose and Crome Ranch: With Mr. Foraker, of the Bakersfield Central Hospital, I visited the above ranch at Edison, east of Bakersfield. The Company has many ranches on the Pacific Coast. At Edison they have built about twenty very comfortable three-room homes for their permanent employees, such as irrigators and tractor drivers. In slack times these are allowed to go out for work on other ranches. The cabins are fitted with inside toilets and showers.

For temporary harvest help there are wood floor tents, with electric light, hot and cold water for showers, and semisanitary toilets. The improved housing on this ranch has largely been provided since the "Anti-Squatter Campaign" of 1937.

(5) A Small Shafter Farm: Peter Ohanneson, City Attorney of Shafter, has a farm of 120 acres. He raises cotton, grain, potatoes, and onions. A year ago he employed Bill Evans, a recent arrival from Oklahoma. Bill had a tent, a wife, and four boys. A fifth boy recently joined the other four. Mr. Ohanneson provided this family with a roofed tent near one of the ranch wells. I found the family now living in three floored, roofed, and partially boarded tent cabins. They are rapidly improving their home. Bill and wife have purchased a radio, electric cook stove, and electric refrigerator. He has a car, a cow and heifer calf, and a flower and vegetable garden. Bill calls his employer Peter. They chaff each other like old friends. Bill receives $3.00 per day, besides a rent-free home and free water and electricity. Mr. Ohanneson suggests that any farmer with forty or more acres of land might help at least one migrant family establish a permanent home, even if he could not give full time employment.

6. *Other reports.*—More than $3,000,000 has been spent in the State to improve housing in the private camps. But this averages only about $10 per each white migrant.

Mr. Harold Pomeroy, Executive Secretary for the Associated Farmers, says that Madera County farmers have built 2,800 cabins and houses during the last five years. In another county one farmer alone, he says, has spent $300,000 in additional housing. Many farmers allow migrant families to remain throughout the year, even though their services may be needed only during the harvest season (Pro America, September, 1939).

The Associated Farmers of Kern County on September 16th, 1939, sent a message to the member farmers urging them to keep their camps for the cotton harvest workers clean, sanitary, and up to the specifications of the Division of Immigration and Housing. There were eight detailed points in these instructions.

7. *Private real estate projects.*—(1) One mile north of Visalia, I visited "the Home Project Tract" opened by Mr. D. Moorsalian. Mr. Moorsalian, an elderly Armenian, has owned this land, which was formerly a vineyard, since 1918. He has sold lots averaging 50 x 155 to about 70 families, of whom 40% are recent immigrants. Some of them pay $1.00 down and $1.00 per month for each $100.00 which they owe. I could not learn the price of the lots. The lot owners are gradually building permanent homes. Gas, electricity and water are installed. While some of the homes were still very crude, all seventy families seemed to be on the way to a permanent home. Some of them had vegetable and flower gardens and one a cow.

(2) Two miles north of Shafter, across from the Santa Fe tracks, Mrs. Emma Mayer began to subdivide 25 acres in January, 1936. Lots 50 x 116 to 50 x 150 ft. were sold for $110 to $250. There have been 55 purchasers. Sixteen cabins she rents for $4 to $5 per week. She asks $10 down and $10 per month for her lots, but she adjusts to the capacity of her clients. Of 49 purchases only two have not paid in full. Some have purchased several lots and built cabins to rent to others. Water, gas and electricity are available. Living quarters vary from tents to neat plaster cabins with vegetable and flower gardens. Sanitary arrangements are of all types. Mrs. Mayer plans to open another twenty-acre subdivision with a little higher grade of residential requirements. But her poorest clients are on the way up in the living scale.

(3) At Farmersville, families are purchasing $150 lots at $2.00 per month, and building their own cabins. This town is a center from which workers go out for fruit and orange picking, for smudging, for grape, beet and cotton harvesting and for work in the packing houses and driers. They travel easily from

fifteen to twenty miles. A contractor often collects his crew in the town and takes the workers out in his own trucks.

(4) I also visited the McNew Addition on Cottonwood Road west of Bakersfield. The price of the lots here on very poor land is said to be $130 up. Public utilities are not yet available. Wells, about 30 feet deep, have been sunk. Several families may use one well. Houses are of all types from the poorest shacks to a neat four-room building, which probably later will be plastered and become a comfortable home.

The obvious value of such subdivisions, however crude they may be, is that they are within the financial reach of a migrant family. They make possible a step-up from a roving life to a gradually improving permanent home.

(5) Fourteen miles east of Los Angeles, near El Monte, is a 100-family project, started in 1936 by what is now the Federal Farm Security Administration. The "El Monte Community Association," a California corporation, borrowed $286,080 from the Federal Government, with 40 years to make the final payment. By September, 1939, $31,360 had been repaid. Most of the residential units are being purchased by the members. Delinquencies on August 31 were only $667.19. Each home is on a one-acre plot.

This project has stimulated a great "back to a suburban farm" movement. Early in October, when I visited this community, I found along Garvie Avenue a score or more real estate agents who for $750 to $1,000 payable by the month, have sold hundreds, if not thousands, of one acre or smaller farm plots. On these the owners have built homes, ranging from temporary shacks to beautiful flower-surrounded, painted bungalows. While I was lunching at a sandwich counter one of the "farmers," earning $100 a month in flood prevention work, told me with pride that he was going home to a 4:00 o'clock dinner of chicken and vegetables, "all raised on my place."

(6) In Bell Gardens, ten miles southeast of Los Angeles, a community of 25,000 persons has sprung up since 1933. This started as a shack town. Many from the Dust Bowl bought acre lots, $10 down, $5 per month, put up their tents and went out "to rustle a job." Nearby were an increasing number of industrial plants, employing cheap labor. Willing to work for a small wage, the newcomers doubtless depressed the wage level. But they found jobs, brought in lumber, and with the help of neighbors put up their little homes, planted their gardens, and organized their own churches, schools, library, and a Chamber of Commerce. It is said that 99.5% of the residents already own or are purchasing their homes.

On October 8, 1939, I found in the center of the community, painted bungalows with flower-ornamented lawns. On the fringes there were still tents, shacks, and goat pastures. But in the midst even of these was a concrete mixer helping to lay the solid foundation for a permanent home. "At a Fiesta in Bell Gardens," writes William Burk, "I watched a parade as it passed in front of the neat stores, with its well-dressed people cheering. Here is a strong community spirit with crime and serious delinquency practically unknown." Although, due to lack of adequate youth clubs and recreation facilities, there is some petty thieving.

Bell Gardens has demonstrated how mid-west rural character, if homes and jobs are available, does not break down even when people are transplanted to crowded urban life. The Coordinating Council which sprang up spontaneously as a sort of town meeting seems to have had large influence in the wholesome development of this community. Beginning January 1, 1940, Rev. Graydon McClellan, representing the Presbyterian Church, plans to work in this area.

The fortuitous opening of real estate subdivisions should not be stopped, but we need in California more of the type of home building carried on by the Hoess Brothers in Hammond, Indiana, as reported in the Readers Digest of October, 1939. These brothers, wage earners themselves, estimate that "few families can safely pay more than two years' income for a home. The average American workman earns $1,300 a year in good years." The Hoess Brothers therefore sell their houses for an average of $2,600.

Cannot the Division of Immigration and Housing encourage the openings of subdivisions where employment is available, and thus prevent the probable development of new slums due to absence of work opportunities?

8. *California Employment Service.*—The State Department of Employment, affiliated with the United States Employment Service, through the 82 offices in the State, keeps in touch with the need for laborers.

On July 15th, 1939, an experimental information booth was set up on Highway 99 twelve miles south of Bakersfield. Farm laborers are advised as to the possibility of work in the neighborhood and in the entire State. Daily reports are received from Employment Service officers in various agricultural areas, giving cropping conditions, wages, housing and an estimate of the local labor supply.

9. *The Simon J. Lubin Society of California, Inc.*—Simon J. Lubin, late Commissioner of Immigration and Housing, was chief among champions of California's rural working population. To provide aid for both wage earners and working farmers, and to protect their interests, the Simon J. Lubin Society is organized. The Society strives to educate public opinion regarding the problems of the working farmer, the condition of agricultural laborers, and the need of both for progressive organization to better their conditions. Reference to the Society's publications is made in the appendix.

10. *Church activities.*—The Council of Women for Home Missions, under the leadership of Mrs. F. E. Shotwell, 83 McAllister St., San Francisco, represents 18 denominations and 23 National Home Mission Boards. This Society is rendering a social service through nursing and religious education. Two nurses and ten part time workers are employed in California. These workers move from crop to crop with the migrants. They conduct story hours, Sunday Schools, mothers' groups and recreation for young people. Dr. Mark Dawber, General Secretary of the Home Missions Council, and Miss Edith Lowry of the Council of Women for Home Missions, under which Mrs. Shotwell and these nurses work, have formed a joint committee of denominational boards to place ministers and their wives in the fields. The first to be located in California are Rev. and Mrs. Addison Moore, Presbyterians, formerly working at Pleasanton, California. They will enlist and train church groups and help them serve migrants in local communities as these harvesters come in.

The United Church Women of Los Angeles have raised $150.00 to help support one of the day nurseries. They also collect and forward clothing and religious literature.

The Glendale Council of Church Women has provided half the salary of a religious education director at the Hemet Community Center.

The Southern California Council of Church Women, of which Mrs. R. L. Bowen is president, takes responsibility for the promotion and support of work for migrants throughout Southern California.

The Rosenberg Foundation in San Francisco has made a grant to the Council of Women for Home Missions for the support of four day nurseries for pre-school children of migrant families in Fresno and Merced Counties during the cotton season.

"Methodist Men" of California are working with the Home Missions Council. The men in the south have raised $1,800, and the men in the north are planning to raise a similar amount. By November 1st they hope to place a minister and his wife in the area east and south of Fresno, especially in the cotton belt. The plan seems to be to try by personal contact to discover the needs and the interests of these people and develop ways to meet their special religious tastes.

Under the direction of Rev. Mr. Edwards, of the Buttonwillow Baptist Church, northwest of Bakersfield, Rev. Mr. Peach has organized three weekday religious schools in ranch camps. Mr. Edwards is following up this work, and Mr. Peach has gone to Shafter to cooperate with the Mennonite and Baptist churches in a similar undertaking.

Rev. Byron P. Hovey, at the Methodist church in the little village of Poplar in Tulare County, is doing an outstanding piece of community work for the migrants. Back of the church building is an open air playground. Next to the church is a large hall owned by the church and used as a community center. In the "Community Council," which Hovey has formed, are representatives of the Grange, Farm Bureau, the Schools, the Merchants, and other individuals.

The church and the Community Council, with the aid of a women's club, a nurse provided by the Council of Women for Home Missions, the churches of Porterville and other centers, the Red Cross, the County Health Department, and four W. P. A. recreational workers, are conducting the following program:

A Baby Clinic.

A Nursery for children of cotton pickers. In some cases breakfasts and lunches for all are served.

Outdoor games for children and adults.

Indoor games and crafts for all.

Social gatherings.

Educational lectures and discussions.

Children and parents are gradually finding their church home in this active religious center.

The Turlock Ministerial Union is planning work for the fruit pickers next spring.

A Southern California "Migrant Cooperating Committee" has been formed, composed of representatives of the Los Angeles United Church Women, Methodist Men, Epworth Leagues, Friends Service Committee, John Steinbeck Committee, and Save the Children Fund. Mrs. Thomas M. Buley, 800 Rome Drive, Los Angeles, is chairman and Mrs. C. C. Douglas, 5722 Buena Vista Terrace, is Secretary. Mrs. Buley and Mrs. Douglas are carrying on an aggressive campaign of education among the churches, using this bulletin and other publications.

11. *Legislation.*—Bills passed the recent State Assembly (1) strengthening the law regarding farm labor contractors and (2) providing more aid for schools for migratory workers' children.

There is a bill before the National Congress proposing to set up a Federal Board to investigate and form a plan for the nation-wide employment of migrants. There is a proposal that as many as possible of these people be turned back to their original homes with sufficient gas and food to carry them to their destination, and that help be given to reinstate them at home.

Another suggestion is that wherever, as in the Pacific Northwest, new irrigation projects are opened, these needy migrants be given opportunity to settle.

A member of the Salinas group remarked: "It is very important to correlate the activities of the Federal, State, and County organizations. There must be some form of united treatment."

12. *Mineral King Farm Association.*—Fifteen families have been settled by the Farm Security Administration on an experimental cooperative farm of 530 acres near Visalia. This was started in March 1938. All the men are either farmers or farm laborers, married, and with a family.

Each family pays $1.00 a month membership dues and $1.00 per month for water.

The Association is incorporated under the California State law. The members elect a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer. The Association leases the property from the Farm Security Administration, paying $3,900.00 in 1939. A new lease will be made for 1940. Other similar farms are being started at Thornton, near Lodi, at Firebaugh in Fresno County, at Yuba City, and in Indio.

The farm conducts a dairy and raises cotton, alfalfa and hogs. They borrow money from the Farm Security Administration and pay 30¢ per hour for labor. When the crops are sold this is repaid and the profits go to the members. Some of the profits have been put into a herd of cattle and used to purchase hogs.

Frank E. Nagel, the manager, says that the steps up in the social and economic scale for migrants are:

(1) The Federal Labor Camps;
(2) Labor homes in connection with the camps;
(3) The cooperative farms;
(4) The establishment of their own homes where the families can be permanently housed.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The well-supported proposed short cuts to security and the many rural strikes in recent years should be a warning to California. Suffering people are realizing their power in numbers and in the vote. If the misery of these American migrant residents is not relieved, further violence and trouble may arise. To save the great agricultural industry of California from a forced division of its holdings and a drastic change in organization, it may be necessary for the industry itself to discover and apply a prompt cure for the painful condition of these migrants. All possible measures of alleviation must be taken. No one plan will be adequate. Every common sense device to meet the need should be adopted. City, County, State, and Federal Governments, Chambers of Commerce, Farm Organizations, Educational and Religious Groups, Service Clubs, and other organizations throughout the State should contribute to the solution of this great problem. Passing the buck from group to group will never alleviate a situation so complicated as this. Each section of the community must do its part.

The following suggestions have grown out of this study:

1. All branches of Government, especially the Federal, must recognize that a considerable number of immigrant families now in California, because of sickness, poverty, and thwarted effort, have lost their morale. One-tenth or more are now on relief. Many will probably never be out of the pauper class. Rehabilitation of those who are down and out will be very difficult. Many families, therefore, will probably require permanent aid.

2. The Federal Government and the States and Counties of the midwest and south should be urged to keep their own people busy and secure in their present places of residence. Unlimited immigration to California is bringing an unfair and impossible load upon the State.

3. California should assist the return to their homes in other states of those who can be reinstated in this way. However, the fact must be accepted that most of those now in California will remain. In one camp I met a man who had been sent back to Oklahoma. He told the typical story. "There were no crops to harvest there," he said, "so I returned to California."

4. We should encourage the Federal Government to continue to provide an increasing number of camps for the new, poorer transients. The group which met at the Salinas Chamber of Commerce agreed: "If we don't have more come we can absorb those now here." These camps are one step in the absorption of those now in the State.

5. The State Employment Bureau, the U. S. Employment Service and other government and business agencies should accumulate more accurate statistical information. Estimates of the number of migrant workers needed in each community at each season and of the length of employment should be prepared. The Employment Agencies should attempt to move the available workers to these areas as needed, and not to create an over supply. The labor information activities carried on by the State Employment Service in the Bakersfield roadside booth should be extended to the Arizona border, Imperial Valley, the Oregon border, both coast and central highway, and to such other localities as experience may suggest.

6. Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California, suggests that these migrants be "placed on small garden plots adjacent to as much employment as possible where they can raise a portion of their subsistence, live in a decent house, and keep the children in one school as long as possible." From this base the father and older sons can migrate when necessary. The typical migratory family in California earns between $350 and $450 a year. If the family could occupy a home similar to one of the $8.20 per month cabins provided in small numbers in the Federal Camps, and raise a crop on the irrigated three-fifths of an acre, then the $400 cash which might be earned in the harvest fields, with what could be raised on the little home plot, might gradually reinstate the group.

7. Some types of large cooperative farms will probably have to be undertaken for many of the better-class migrant farmers. Just what form these will take there seems to be no definite indication. Little agricultural patches, privately cultivated, centering around a cooperative dairy, a cooperative store, a cooperative waetr supply, a community church, and other joint activities may be one experiment which should be tried. Some cooperative home industries, such as making furniture, sewing, shoe repairing, preserving and canning of food, might be carried on at a center built in a cooperative farm area. The experience of Berea College, Kentucky, has shown the possibilities in forestry, the breeding of swine, sheep, beef cattle, horses, and poultry; in all sorts of gardening, baking, printing, weaving, woodwork, laundry work, storekeeping, and in art work. The migrants need special help in homemaking, diet, cooking, sewing, and local farm technique.

8. In February 1939, President Roosevelt ordered an investigation of the migrant labor situation throughout the country by W. P. A. Administrator Harrington. This report should be made public.

9. A few ranchers as I have described, have already demonstrated what can be done to provide permanent homes for the better class of migratory farmers. To extend this movement an earnest campaign of education and encouragement should be carried on among the employing ranchers, large and small. Each employer should be asked, urged, and, if necessary, helped financially to provide permanent homes on his ranch for the families who could be of some help to him the year round and provide a part of the labor needed in the rush season. During the slack season on the home ranch, the men and older boys of these families could be encouraged and guided, as Dr. Taylor suggests, to go out to other agricultural sections where harvesters are in demand. Thus by the older members of the family earning an extra cash income within a radius of 50 and 100 miles of their permanent home, and living, if necessary, during this migrant period in somewhat primitive workers' camps, the mother and school-age children could have a permanent residence and the family could be rehabilitated. If Chambers of Commerce, Agricultural Organizations, Church, Educational and other groups should take up this campaign, and the banks even offer to lend to ranchers a little money to

modernize their cabins, the misery of thousands of the better-class families could be relieved in a very few months.

10. Diversified agriculture should be practiced increasingly. Large farmers should aim to raise such crops as will keep the major part of their workers occupied the year round. On the Sierra Vista Ranch Mr. Di Georgio is raising asparagus and lettuce to occupy his workers when grape pruning and harvesting are out of season.

11. Educational films showing actual conditions and problems should be taken and shown in churches, clubs, and schools. The contrast between shack towns and government camps, the better class of the farm cabins, and the new subdivisions should be pictured so that the actual conditions may be made known.

Mr. Floyd J. Feaver, of Whittier College, whose father has a large cotton ranch near Farmersville, has already taken a few movie films in color.

12. The recommendations of the California Governor's Commission on Reemployment should receive serious consideration. This Commission finds that there are still (October 1, 1939) 50,000 people living in jungle camps and jallopies. The Commission recommends two primary programs:

(1) That the State constitute a housing authority and build in appropriate districts on the basis of the average farm need permanent homes for agricultural workers. Five zones should be established with at least 1,000 houses in each zone. In each section of a zone there should be between 50 and 300 houses located where they will be near farm work. In each section there is planned a cooperative farm to be managed by the Farm Security Administration, similar to the farm at Mineral King. For the above, $15,000,000 is needed. The State must provide $1,500,000 to secure the balance from the Federal Government. The razing of tents and jungle towns will meet the slum-clearance conditions of the Federal Housing Administration.

(2) That the State, through the Housing and Immigration Commission, appropriate money for additional migratory camps, similar to the Federal camps. It is estimated that $500,000 would provide for 21 more camps, with about 300 families in each camp.

13. Churches in California near migrant camps or other settlements should extend all possible material, social, and spiritual aid to these newcomers. The stronger churches in cities, as some are already doing, should offer their aid to rural churches. The cooperation of the Federal Recreation Project might be secured for community undertakings.

14. There is a rumor that in some counties the right to vote has been refused to residents of migratory labor camps, although they fulfill all the legal requirements of voters. Public-spirited persons should see to it that the constitutional rights of these people are not infringed.

15. *Final conclusions.*—The potential buying and consuming power of these 250,000 new white residents seems to have been overlooked. Shallow-minded observers appear to think that in a community there are a certain number of jobs. Each newcomer, they say, can only add to the number of the jobless. But these quarter of a million immigrants are a great potential market for California products of all sorts, from food and shoes to frigidaires and the movies. As soon as each family is established on a solid economic foundation it will contribute a real part to the material business of the State and to the increase of employment.

The brilliant school record of some of their children and the deep religious interest of many of the adults suggest also a possible real contribution which they may make to both education and religion.

These people must be changed from a liability into an asset. Our primary responsibility, therefore, is to help them establish permanent homes and to secure work, which will integrate them constructively in the economic, social, and religious life of the State. The task should be well under way by the summer of 1940.

The tendency, all too evident six months ago, to pass the responsibility from one organization to another, and from one governmental body to another, seems to have died down. Each section of the State and each section of the Nation seems to be accepting more responsibility. Congressman Jerry Voorhis said in June at the Buffalo National Conference of Social Work: "This is one of the two or three major American problems." Every American citizen, therefore, should feel a responsibility for raising the standards of living of those who provide our meals three times a day. "They starve that we may eat," it has been said. Would not we starve but for their work?

IV. APPENDIX

A. *Reference Materials.*

(References which proved most valuable to the writer have been set in italic type.)

1. Materials from the Farm Security Administration, 85 Second St., San Francisco.

(1) *What Shall We Do With Them?* Dr. Paul S. Taylor, associate professor of economics, University of California. Address before the Commonwealth Club, April 15, 1939. Mimeographed, 9 pp.

(2) *Synopsis of Survey of Migratory Labor Problems in California.* Dr. Paul S. Taylor. Mimeographed, 9 pp.

(3) *Migrant Farm Labor: The Problem and Ways of Meeting It.* Mimeographed, 15 pp.

(4) The Child in the Migratory Camp—Education. Mimeographed, 7 pp.

(5) The Child in the Migratory Camp—Health. Mimeographed, 4 pp.

(6) Why Plan Security for the Migratory Laborer? Mimeographed, 9 pp.

(7) Health Problems Among the Migratory Workers. Mimeographed, 9 pp.

(8) The Farm Security Administration in Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and California. Mimeographed, 4 pp.

(9) The Farm Security Administration's Low-Cost Medical Program. Mimeographed, 9 pp.

(10) Refugee Labor Migration to California. 1937. Printed, 11 pp.

(11) Patterns of Agricultural Labor Migration Within California. Printed, 11 pp.

(12) The Nation's Soil and Human Resources. Mimeographed, 19 pp.

(13) Release to Morning Papers of April 20, 1939. Careful analysis of 6,655 case histories.

(14) Agriculture and Industry. L. I. Hewes, Jr. Talk given at Ames, Iowa, May 10, 1939. Mimeographed, 7 pp.

(15) How the Farm Security Administration is Helping Needy Farm Families. Dr. Will Alexander, May 24, 1939. Mimeographed, 8 pp.

(16) Two Trends of Great Agricultural Significance. O. E. Baker, agricultural economist, June 1939. Mimeographed, 19 pp. and charts.

(17) The Place of Agricultural Labor in Society. Dr. Paul S. Taylor, June 15, 1939. Mimeographed, 11 pp.

(18) Internal Migration—An Asset or Liability? John N. Webb, Works Projects Administration, Buffalo Conference of Social Work, June 19, 1939. Mimeographed, 13 pp.

(19) The Migration of Farm Labor. M. G. Evans, Farm Security Administration, June 21, 1939. Mimeographed, 8 pp.

(20) Housing for Migratory Agricultural Workers. From Public Welfare News, July 1939. Mimeographed, 8 pp.

(21) The Work of the Farm Security Administration in Region IX. September 1939. Mimeographed, 8 pp.

(22) How the European Countries Have Solved Their Housing Problems. Doris M. Porter. Mimeographed, 4 pp.

2. From the Simon J. Lubin Society of California, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.:

(1) Their Blood is Strong. John Steinbeck. Printed, 36 pp. April 1938. Illustrated, 25 cents.

(2) Report of the Simon J. Lubin Society submitted to the President's Committee on Farm Tenancy. San Francisco, January 12, 1937.

This is a study of strikes, vigilantes' activities and of both labor and employer organizations among agriculturists in California. Mimeographed, 12 pp.

3. From the Council of Women for Home Missions, 83 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif.:

(1) They Starve That We May Eat. Edith E. Lowry. Printed, 72 pp. Illustrated. Price 35 cents.

(2) Report of Migrant Work, 1938. Western Area. Mimeographed, 4 pp.

(3) A Volume of Service. Printed in Colors. 12 pp.

(4) Our Migrant Brother. Printed, 4 pp.

4. Miscellaneous:

(1) The Church and the Last American Migration. E. E. Wilson for the Social Action Fellowship, California Conference, Methodist Church. Printed, 20 pp. Illustrated. No address given.

(2) As a Woman Sees It. Mrs. Jesse M. Bader. Save the Children Fund. Printed folder, 6 pp.

(3) Survey of Kern County Migratory Labor Problem. Kern County Health Department, Bakersfield, 1937. Mimeographed, 15 pp.

(4) Supplementary Report (to the above) as of July 1, 1938. Mimeographed, 9 pp.

(5) Supplementary Report (to the above) as of July 1, 1939. Mimeographed, 10 pp.

(6) Role of the General Hospital in Kern County. July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939. Mimeographed, 18 pp.

(7) Report of Division of Immigration and Housing, State of California. January 1 to July 1, 1939. Carey McWilliams, State Building, Los Angeles. Mimeographed, 21 pp.

(8) The Merritt System. Frank J. Taylor. Reader's Digest, February 1939.

(9) Migratory Labor—A Social Problem. Fortune Magazine, April 1939. Price $1. (Out of print.)

(10) No Jobs in California. Saturday Evening Post, November 12, 1938.

(11) Article by Miss Helen Hefferman, California Journal of Elementary Education. February 1939, published by California State Department of Education.

(12) The End of the Trail. Editorial by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, PhD., Catholic Charity Review, March 1939.

(13) Glimpses of Berea College: The Contrast House, Berea, Ky.

(14) A Summer in the Country. National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Avenue, N. Y. City. 39 pp. 25 cents. March 1939.

(15) Grapes of Wrath. John Steinbeck. The Viking Press. $2.75. April 1939.

(16) Pick for Your Supper, A Study of Child Labor Among Migrants on the Pacific Coast. James E. Sidel. National Child Labor Committee. 67 pp. 35 cents. June 1939.

(17) Factories in the Field. Carey McWilliams. Boston, Little, Brown and Co. $2.50. July 1939.

(18) America's Own Refugees. Look Magazine, August 29, 1939.

(19) Who Are the Associated Farmers? R. L. Neuberger (of Oregon). Survey Graphic, September 1939.

(20) Report of the Governor's Commission on Re-employment. John R. Richards, Chairman. October 1939. Any State Office in California.

(21) An American Exodus. Dorothea Lange and Paul S. Taylor. New York. Reynal and Hitchcock. $2.75. 1939.

B. Members of Los Angeles County Committee for Church and Community Cooperation: Dr. Willsie Martin, Chairman; Dr. James W. Fifield, Jr.; Dr. Frank Fagersburg; Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin; Dr. Glenn W. Moore, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thos. J. O'Dwyer; Rt. Rev. W. Betrand Stevens; Rev. Charance H. Parlour, Recording Secretary; Dr. George Gleason, Executive Secretary, Room 1109, 139 No. Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. *Final Word, May 1, 1940.*

During her recent visit to California, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt suggested that efforts should be made to settle the wandering migrants on vacant California land. Almost the same day Herbert Hoover urged that each family be provided with a five-acre farm.

On April 20, 1940, as reported in the Los Angeles Times, the State Chamber of Commerce advocated:

1. Rehabilitation and reestablishment of migrants in the States of their origin.
2. Increase of the Federal Labor Camps.
3. Development of permanent private housing by farmers on their own farms.
4. More adequate service by the State Employment Service.

With all of the above, the findings of this Report agree.

Mr. Abbott. I offer a report, Transiency in Southern California, offered by former chief of police, James E. Davis.[1]

(The report referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and is reprinted below:)

---

[1] See also report by Mr. Davis on p. 2978.

TRANSIENCY IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles Police Department, James E. Davis, Chief of Police, December 1, 1937

Foreword: Prior to 1930, the transient situation in the United States was based to a large extent on the theory of either completely neglecting to recognize the problem of the migratory transient, or to recognize it as a constant irritant calling for deterrents. Every community made an effort to provide as little relief as possible for nonresidents in order not to attract transients, or to encourage them to move on. During the depression, however, certain modifications were necessary. Investigation shows that the Federal Transient Service was aiding 77,118 individuals in April 1935, who had been in California less than 1 year, this total including approximately 1,0000 single women and 28,000 persons in family cases.[1]

NUMBER OF TRANSIENTS

It has been conservatively estimated by welfare and other groups interested in the activity of transients, that anywhere from 300,000 to 600,000 city, State and interstate transients are roaming the United States, bringing a transient problem to every major city.

The flight across the country of drought refugees and migrants in need of manual employment which was evident in 1935, continued during the first half of 1936. Those entering California still came in significant numbers but at a slower rate than in the fall and winter of 1935, according to recordings made by the border inspectors of the Bureau of Plant Quarantine, California Department of Agriculture. The movement during the last half of 1935 involved 43,180 persons in out-of-State cars, whereas it dropped 36 percent to 27,867 persons in the first 6 months of 1936. For the year from June 16, 1935, to June 15, 1936, a total of 71,047 such migrants entered the State. In addition, 16,315 Californians who had left the State in search of employment reentered its borders during the year. Thus, for the entire period, 87,362 drought refugees and other migrants in need of manual employment arrived in or returned to California.[2] (See exhibit 1.) These figures do not include entrants by train or auto stage.

The Department of Agriculture, State of California, which maintains State border quarantine stations along the entire border of the State of California, reported 2,324,095 passengers entering the State via automobile during the year 1936. This figure does not include trucks, local and stage passengers. (See exhibit II.) Of this amount, 1,138,526 entered the southern part of the State.

During the period of July 1, 1935 to June 30, 1937, 169,233 migrants in need of employment entered California by motor vehicle, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration statistics. (See exhibit III.) It should be noted that this count includes only migrants entering by automobile, who are stopped by the plant quarantine inspectors at the State's border stations. It cannot be taken as the net migration since there was no measurement of the outflow.

Although the records of incoming cars is kept at the border by the State agriculture department, no accurate records of the incoming transients arriving by freight train are kept. During the period from May 1937 to October 1937, inclusive, it is estimated that approximately 28,925 transients came into Los Angeles County by riding the freight trains. (See exhibit IV.)

ORIGINAL PLACES OF RESIDENCE

The drought, affecting large areas of the United States from 1933 to 1935, and which continued to burn many parts of the Great Plains area in 1936, resulted in a great volume of refugees migrating from the drought and Dust Bowl areas to the Western States of the Nation.[1]

Eighty-four and forty-four one-hundredths percent of the migrants flowing into this State during the 2-year period from July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1937, came from the drought States; 9.1 percent from Pacific States; 4.2 percent from the industrial States; 2.0 percent from the Southern States; and 0.3 percent from the New England States. (See exhibit III.)

A recent 16-day survey covering the period from August 16 to August 31, 1937, shows that 4,975 passengers crossed the borders and were checked by the border stations. The largest number, 3,643, came from the drought States. (See exhibit V.)

---

[1] P. 32, Transients in California.

[2] P. 1355, Monthly Labor Review, December 1936, Drought Refugee and Labor Migration to California in 1936, by Edward J. Rowell.

Exhibit III also indicates that the peak was reached during the July 1 to December 31, 1936, period, and declined sharply during the succeeding 6 months period.

The largest exodus was from the State of Oklahoma, the center of the Dust Bowl. Arizona, Arkansas and Texas contributed respectively to the number of out-of-State migrants flocking to our borders. These figures alone are sufficient to estimate the terrific social and economic disruptions occurring in the Dust Bowl area of the Middle West, resulting in a great deal of human suffering and financial loss.

The Pacific States, comprising Oregon and Washington (the State of California is not included in this study of the immigration of transients) contributed the next largest number of transients, to wit: 2,940 in the 2-year period. As noted by Mr. Edward J. Rowell in The Monthly Labor Review for December 1936, * * * "it is probably that these migrants are persons who normally follow the harvests as a source of livelihood, in contrast to the people from the Dust Bowl who have been deprived of their customary economic pursuits." [2]

No significant part was played by the industrial, Southern, and New England States in contributing to the migratory problem of the State of California.

In further studying the great influx, particularly this year, of persons from the drought States, the United States Farm Placement Service has compiled a series of charts, showing month by month invasion of these people, who, deprived of their homes and jobs, bring with them a great economic and social burden. (See exhibits X, XI, XII, XII, XIV, XV, and XVI.)

MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION

The majority of transients come by automobile, traveling in run-down, dilapidated cars. A large number come by freight train (see exhibit IV) and by hitchhiking.

It was learned by Taylor and Vasey in reporting on Drought Refugees and Labor Migration to California in 1936 that there was an average of four persons in each of 13,000 cars crossing the State line. They also determined that 55.7 percent of all arriving in out-of-State cars came through Arizona, and 24.3 percent came through Nevada—the balance coming from Oregon.

PERIOD OF MIGRATION

Mr. Rowell in his report Drought Refugees and Labor Migration to California in 1936 says:

"The importance of occupational opportunities in California agriculture as a factor in these migrations is emphasized in the flow of returning Californians during the same period. Although the peak of returning Californians was reached in July, the months of July, August, and September were the months of heaviest immigration for this group. In the months of January and February, California migrants again showed a slight variation in comparison with those from other States. Returning Californians in January actually exceeded those for February. These variations from the tendencies indicated for out-of-State migrants are undoubtedly due to the greater responsiveness of Californians to the State's agricultural operations. They are concerned almost exclusively with harvest opportunities, whereas migrants from others States are also motivated by economic distress in the areas from which they come.

"Another characteristic of the migrations of returning Californians is that, following the general decline from July to March, with the exceptions of January and February, the increase in migrations during the succeeding 3 months was not proportionately so great as in the case of persons from other areas."

Quoting further from Mr. Rowell's report: "Migrations may normally be expected to decline in the spring of the year, owing to absence of harvest opportunities in California. However, the border blockade established by the Los Angeles police somewhat accentuates this expectancy in the case at hand and thus illustrates the possible influence of accidental factors. Since no norm is available, part of the sharp decline from February to March of 1936 must be imputed to the border blockade. The March migrations (2,522 persons) were considerably below those of any other month."

---

[2] P. 1355, Monthly Labor Review, December 1936, Drought Refugee and Labor Migration to California in 1936, by Edward J. Rowell.

CAUSES OF MIGRATION

The southern California climate is an important factor in the migration of transients to the southern part of the State. They enter by way of Arizona, which has favorable weather during the winter months.

Opportunities for employment in the agricultural districts in Imperial Valley are also a factor which should be taken into consideration when studying the transient movement to this portion of the State during the winter months. There are only two sources of employment in this State, to wit: First, private industry and agriculture; second, Public Works projects. We know that private industry and agriculture can readily recruit sufficient workers who are permanent residents of the State. The Federal Government requires that those working upon public works projects be residents of the political subdivision sponsoring the project. Therefore, it may be readily concluded that the indigent transients invading California does no do so for the sole purpose of seeking employment, but also to forage his way, through criminal operations or otherwise, to sustain himself.

The great drought, floods, and other calamities in various sections of the country are responsible for the recent very large influx of indigent transients. In compiling statistics showing the inflow of migrants from the drought States for the first half of the year 1937, the United States Farm Placement services, in a series of reports, shows that from January 1 to June 30, 1937 (inclusive), 37,534 persons entered the State from the drought areas. (See exhibits VII and VIII.)

NATIONALITIES AND TYPES OF TRANSIENTS

Reports indicate that the number of white Americans entering the State of California, from all States of the Nation and checked through border checking stations for the year 1936, are far greater than other races and nationalities. The United States Department of Labor, Employment Service, reports that of 21,379 cars entering the State, carrying 97,642 passengers, 89,929 were white persons, 1,441 were colored, 3,816 were Mexican, 1,793 were Filipino, and 663 were others. (See exhibit VI.)

In checking the nationalities of persons entering the State from the drought area, a predominating number of white Americans entered the line. Negroes, Mexicans, and Filipinos were apparent, but in minor groups. A later report for the month of July 1937, shows the same predominance. (See exhibit IX, p. 23.)

Although there are no exact figures available, there seems to be no doubt, from the records and experience of social workers, that single men contribute most heavily to the problem of transiency. Single destitute transients move over the country, from city to city, in larger numbers than family groups, or women. These homeless men provide the largest problem for the relief, health, and police authorities dealing with interstate transients.

RELIEF AND WELFARE POSSIBILITIES FOR TRANSIENTS

The problem of the transient is an old one. Particularly in California have we been faced for many years with the question of what to do with these migratory wanderers. Many persons blame the great increase in the influx of itinerants upon the recent depression, the drought, floods, and the Dust Bowl, but members of the welfare agencies and the law-enforcement agencies of the country and State, while aware of the importance of these factors in increasing the transient load, know that we have been coping with this situation for many years. Certain localities, of course, are more troubled than others with the problem of destitute transients. The States of California and Florida feel it most acutely.

Not all of the State of California has been concerned, however. Studies made at California boundaries indicate that the majority of transients, arriving in dilapidated automobiles or by freight trains, come to the southern part of the State. Climatic and other factors undoubtedly attract many unfit and destitute persons.

It is absolutely necessary that this great horde of transients invading California be provided with welfare services, unemployment relief, and relief for unemployables.

While there is some exodus of the destitute group from California, it does not nearly balance the influx, and California is faced with a serious problem of providing relief, health, and welfare services for persons who are not residents within her boundaries, and are, therefore, not rightfully entitled to care and assistance.

At present, State relief makes no provision for single transient men, who constitute the largest group of migratory individuals, who are not residents of the State. The State relief administration has established camps in the larger counties for homeless destitute men who have established 1 year's residence in California. These camps, for which sites have been provided by the respective counties, were ready for occupancy October 1, 1937, and will continue in operation until March 1, 1938. Food and shelter are provided by the State, and in return recipients are required to work on county, State, and Federal work projects.

Transients trekking to California, especially southern California, without means of subsistence are facing serious consequences due to present overburdened relief conditions and new State laws limiting protection to California residents. The State relief administration of California extends relief only to employable transients. Either single men or families are assisted until the agency has had an opportunity to ascertain their legal residences, at which time they contact the relief agencies in their home city. These destitute transients are then sent back to their own State. The California agency gives them gas for their cars, or railroad fare back home. Most of these migrants, upon learning from the authorities that the provisions for relief are very small, are glad to return to their own homes. It has been the experience of case workers who interview these individuals, that California has had a reputation for providing a larger share of relief to destitute persons than any other State.

Most States of the Union have laws that automatically cancel "legal residence" after their inhabitants have been absent from the State for a full year. Therefore, it is impossible to return transients to their home States when this year has elapsed. Accordingly, the transient becomes known as a California "nonresident" to relief agencies, but as such is able to receive only slightly more than when he was a "transient." For those who meet the requirements of the California Indigent Act by residing in the State 3 years without financial assistance from others than legally responsible relatives, the allowances are based upon minimum requirements for subsistence.

COST OF RELIEF AND WELFARE SERVICES

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration division of research and statistics shows that the cost of 1 day's care for one transient in New York State varied from 56 cents a day in shelters operated by transient divisions to 75 cents a day in contract shelters (private agencies, etc.). The national average varied from 69 to 72 cents, according to Federal reports. (See exhibit XXIII.)

Over a recent 5-week period, an average of 225 persons came under the care of the State relief administration, Los Angeles office. The average budget per family amounts from $30 to $35 per month. The State relief administration has no ruling which forbids the extending of relief to aliens, and they are helped until employment is found for them, or they obtain jobs themselves. Many eventually find employment in agricultural work.

TREATMENT OF TRANSIENTS

Quoting from Public Relief for Transients Report:

"The phenomena of transiency and of destitution among persons not possessing a legal settlement at the place where need overtakes them are not new. A sizable problem of caring for needy nonsettled persons existed before the depression. The mobility of our population and the development of seasonable employment caused considerable shifting about, which was partially reflected in the necessity for relief. To this natural and normal movement of population must be added the chronic wanderer or hobo who made his way back and forth across the country. The problem of relief, health, and welfare services for interstate transients is urgent."

The economic maladjustment of the past few years has inevitably increased the movement of people from one section of the country to another. The lack of job opportunities in the local community, the development of intolerable home conditions due to poverty and unemployment, and the fact that distant pastures always look more green, have caused many persons to leave their place of residence in the hope of bettering their condition elsewhere.

Whatever may be the cause of the social dislocation of the individual homeless person, the agency to which he applies should either be prepared to give adequate service directly or to refer to some other agency so equipped.

EFFECT OF TRANSIENT RELIEF PROGRAM UPON TRANSIENCY

Obviously, the State transient program did not stop transiency. It did not stop transiency any more than the unemployment relief program stopped unemployment. It offered merely another form of relief, which held little permanent attraction for either the job shirker or the genuine job seeker. While it drew out of the stream of moving unattachable people a large number of men who remained long enough to become rehabilitated and built up physically and socially, their numbers were replaced by others.

EFFECT OF TRANSIENCY ON CRIME FIGURES

Police experience indicates that a large percentage, over 50 percent in fact, of the incoming transients have previously been convicted of one or more criminal offenses. The remaining 50 percent present another large group of potential offenders.

The extent of the criminal element among transients is illustrated by records of persons who have been arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department. The annual winter increase of approximately 20 percent in crime in Los Angeles can be attributed to transients.

The winter increase in crime in the city of Los Angeles, as indicated in exhibit XVII, can be attributed to transients.

The border blockade which continued until April 1936, can be credited with the great decrease in major crimes indicated for that period. (See exhibit XVII.)

Major crime has increased tremendously for the following winter months. (The border blockade was discontinued in April 1936, and was not reestablished during the following year.) (See exhibit XVII.)

Twenty-nine percent of those arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department and later convicted and sentenced to State's prison during the fiscal year 1935–36 were in the county less than 1 year. (See exhibit XVIII.)

Twenty-eight percent of those arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department and later convicted and sentenced to State's prison during the fiscal year 1936–37 were in the county less than 1 year. (See exhibit XVIII.)

Of the persons arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department and committed to State's prison during the fiscal year 1935–36, 23 percent were in the State less than 1 year. (See exhibit XIX.)

Of the persons arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department and committed to the State's prison during the fiscal year 1936–37 23 percent were in the State less than 1 year. (See exhibit XIX.)

Total vagrancy arrests made by the Los Angeles Police Department during the months of January 1937, amounted to 1,326. Of this number 17 percent had previous felony records; 43 percent had previous misdemeanor records, and a total of 60 percent of those arrested for vagrancy had some previous record. (See exhibit XX.)

Of 5,788 cases in which the courts convicted and sentenced on the offense charged for the month of January 1937, 1,642 or 28 percent of those convicted were in the county less than 1 year; and 1,225 or 23 percent were in the State less than 1 year. (See exhibit XXI.)

Of persons convicted, sentenced in Los Angeles County and transported to San Quentin and Folsom Penitentiaries during the fiscal year 1935–36, 18 percent had resided in Los Angeles County for less than 1 year. (See exhibit XXII.)

Of persons convicted, sentenced in Los Angeles County and transported to San Quentin and Folsom Penitentiaries during the fiscal year 1936–37, 18 percent had resided in Los Angeles County for less than 1 year. (See exhibit XXII.)

EFFECT OF TRANSIENCY ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The effect of entire families of transients migrating to our State has shown that approximately 5 percent of the schools' population are children of transients. These children are two to three grades behind in their school work and they must, therefore, associate with children younger than themselves. Their attendance is not steady, and because of the entire nature of their environment, their attitude toward their school work is one of indifference. Because they are idle for the most part, and witness the same behavior among their fellow travelers, and because they oftentimes must go hungry and improperly clothed, juvenile delinquency is common, and these children often present a serious problem to the juvenile authorities.

EFFECT OF TRANSIENCY ON PUBLIC HEALTH

The effects of the wanderings of these nomadic transients on public health have been many and widespread. A large percentage of the transients seeking relief have been found to be afflicted with disease. Tuberculosis, scarlet fever, typhoid fever, mumps, sore eyes, and many other sicknesses are prevalent among the camps provided for these people. In addition to the danger of Statewide epidemics originating in jungle camps inhabited by transients, the campaign of public-health agencies to control the spread of social disease has been seriously affected by the constant migration of transients. The utter lack of sanitation in many of the jungle camps causes much suffering among the transient group. The lack of funds in California for relief of transients not only imposes hardship upon them in their search for the necessities of life, but makes it virtually impossible for them to receive medical aid. State laws prevent public institutions from giving other than emergency care to persons who have resided in the State less than 3 years. Also, while transients find it virtually impossible to gain admission to public hospitals because of legal restrictions, they have almost the same difficulty in obtaining medical care at private clinics because the funds contributed to these clinics are provided for the bona fide residents of the State.

ATTEMPTED SOLUTIONS OF THE PROBLEM

With the tremendous increase in transiency following the economic crash of 1929, private agencies attempted to handle the situation, but found themselves unable to do so. In caring for the transients who enter the State, private agencies are conceded to be a failure. It is difficult to secure funds to meet the needs of those who are definitely legal residents of a given community, and it is much harder to raise money privately for the nonresident than for the resident. Also, the special services of this group would overlap the public services of the State.

The Federal Government attempted to assume, in a large measure, the responsibility for this group, and in 1933 the Federal Emergency Relief Administration of the United States Government established a special transient service throughout the country. By January 1934 there were 261 treatment centers and 27 transient camps throughout the United States providing care for almost 225,000 transients during that month. However, this made necessary the operation of a special service by the Government for a selected group. If the Government sets up special relief agencies for transients, it would result in a duplication of existing State machinery.

The Federal Government experimented with a new solution of the problem in 1935 and failed. In April 1935 the Federal Transient Service was aiding 77,000 individuals who had been in California less than 1 year, this total including approximately 1,000 single women, and 28,000 persons in family cases. The total cost of the transient service from July 1, 1934, to May 30, 1935, amounted to over $4,000,000. The liquidation of the Federal transient camps in October 1935 without due notice being given to the jurisdictions concerned, made it necessary for the relief agencies to assume this burden. There were approximately 306,064 persons being cared for in these camps all over the country (40,430 or approximately one-seventh of this number in California), and the termination of these transient camps has had the effect of increasing the transient load in the various States, causing many individuals to move on and come to California.

In 1936 the Los Angeles Police Department made an effort to cope with this situation, and inaugurated the border patrol, which operated from February 6, 1936, to April 17, 1936, and proved to be very effective. The following year the department was not in a position to carry on such an operation. Instead, the Los Angeles Police Department arranged to police the municipal boundaries of the city of Los Angeles, particularly at the points of ingress of the railways, to arrest all evaders of railroad fares and persons violating any of the sections of the sections of the vagrancy statute. Men were stationed on 24-hour watch at the points of ingress of the freight trains, who stopped and searched each train headed toward Los Angeles. During the period from October 29, 1936, to January 23, 1937, this detail arrested 2,558 railroad evaders and vag roamers. Those arrested, upon conviction and sentence, were placed at manual labor upon firebreaks, roads, and other public works of a similar nature. This program was a great deterrent to the influx of transients in the city of Los Angeles.

The majority of those that were booked as vag roamers were picked up on or adjacent to the railroad right-of-way, and, no doubt, had just dropped off of freight trains. However, in spite of the efforts of our officers to intercept these undesirable transients, many persons managed to evade being stopped and questioned, by hitchhiking their way into the city, or riding the bus across the boundaries. Many of the transients have some money, and pay for train or bus transportation from an adjoining State to the metropolitan area, where they immediately apply to a relief agency. A large number of transients, being informed of the blockade at the boundaries of the city of Los Angeles through publicity given this operation in the newspapers, or word-of-mouth news received from their fellow transients, keep clear of Los Angeles and follow the coast route into Ventura, and hitchhike south on Roosevelt Highway to San Diego. Others, anxious to avoid our city, come down through Bakersfield to Mojave and thence to Barstow, Victorville, San Bernardino, Colton, and Imperial Valley. These transients, because of lack of adequate means of support, and often needing hospitalization, impose an economic burden upon the counties to which they migrate and both public and private agencies are forced to care for them.

The problem in southern California is not alone keeping out the indigent transient, for whom there is practically no relief available, but in preventing the migratory agricultural laborer from drifting into Los Angeles in off-season times. These people, with their families, work in the fields during the harvesting seasons, but inevitably congregate in big centers of population, principally this city. This places a tremendous burden on city relief agencies.

Reciprocal agreement among various States has been suggested. Each State would adopt uniform residence rules and give the same treatment in the way of relief, health, and welfare services to nonresidents as to residents, coupled with a humane and constructive policy of moving transients back to their home States and communities.

THE LOS ANGELES PLAN FOR TRANSIENTS

In order to stop the influx of the transients, who yearly make California their goal, particularly in the winter, and who expect housing, food, and medical care upon their arrival, it is necessary that a definite program be provided for cooperation between the various States, and within the States, between the various counties, as each county furnishes separate ingress, unless all are working simultaneously. The cost to the counties and State would be greatly reduced if the expenditure for policing the points of ingress were sufficient to do a good job. A publicity campaign stressing a "cleaning up" process in all the counties, and carried on simultaneously, would prevent thousands of itinerants from starting for California. The efforts of the border patrol conducted by the Los Angeles Police Department in 1936, were successful in keeping a large number of transients out of the State of California. All Western States showed improved conditions following the border patrol activities of this department.

State agencies or departments may be drafted for service in the transient plan. The department of motor vehicles could be utilized by using the checking stations now in operation, at points of ingress on highways. This service could be handled by the personnel now on duty at checking stations. The points of ingress of railways could be covered by other personnel. Some of these points could be covered in conjunction with the highway detail.

One of the duties of the State board of equalization is the collection of taxes from caravans of cars entering the State. Checks on these caravans could best be made at the border and the men used in making these checks could be utilized in this plan.

The agricultural department of the State could be utilized by using the plant quarantine checking stations now in operation at the points of ingress on highways.

The establishment by the health department of State border quarantine stations for the examination of those having communicable diseases or coming from areas where epidemics are prevalent would eliminate the great hazard to bona fide residents. The plant quarantine stations could be utilized for this purpose.

The State relief administration could assist by acting in accordance with the policy of this agency.

The State of California could also enter into compacts and agreement with the authorities of other Western States, and in this manner lighten the burden of each individual State.

The counties of the State of California could assist materially by appropriating funds for additional deputy sheriffs. Grants could be furnished by the State to the counties of funds for additional sheriff personnel. The counties could also sponsor Work Projects Administration projects for additional personnel, as in the instance of school crossing guards.

The assistance of the railroads could be solicited. These companies could help by making available their special agents; also, by providing for additional special agents, and maintaining close cooperation with law-enforcement agencies.

Over 400,000 persons of this State, who are bona fide residents, are dependent upon relief or Federal works projects, and the increased burden of taxes and contributing to the community chest has created a terrific burden which must be borne by those possessing property, or by persons who receive regular incomes. Since the California Transient Service failed in its purpose, and was closed by the halting of Federal funds, the permanent residents of the State of California have not been able to completely assume their share of the work that had been performed. It has been found that many of the transients who received offers of transportation back home or from whence they came, readily accepted. When they became aware of the economic conditions of welfare agencies of this State, they were as a rule glad to stay home.

LEGAL PROVISIONS

It should be borne in mind that persons taken from trains may be arrested for violation of section 587–C California Penal Code, which provides that evading railway fare is a misdemeanor.

Also, those subjects hitchhiking or wandering from place to place without visible means of support are in violation of section 647, subsection 3 of the Penal Code of California.

In addition to the above offenses, the Pauper Act of the State of California defines as a misdemeanor "an act of bringing into the State of California any indigent or other person knowingly to be or likely to be dependent upon public charity, or the State for support and maintenance."

In an opinion rendered by Attorney General U. S. Webb, addressed to the Honorable Walter M. Dickie, director, department of public health, 313 State Building, San Francisco, Calif., it was stated that the State department of public health has the right, under the law, with certain limitations, as set forth in his communication, to examine people entering the State who may be suspected of having an infectious disease. Also, if they have not sufficient funds to provide proper institutional or hospital care, they can be denied permission to enter the State

EXHIBIT I.—*Migrants in need of manual employment*

Migrants in need of manual employment entering California by motor vehicle, year ending June 15, 1936.[1]

Out-of-State cars: Number of migrants	71, 047
California cars: Number of migrants	16, 315
Total	87, 362

[1] Judgment of border station inspectors was relied upon in distinguishing migrants in need of manual employment. Such persons are ordinarily easily identifiable since they travel in family groups, and are loaded with poor equipment.

EXHIBIT II.—*Traffic summary, State border quarantine stations, year 1936*

Stations	Total cars less trucks, locals, and stages	Foreign cars less trucks, locals, and stages	Total passengers less truck, local, and stage passengers	Commercial trucks		Number of stages	Number of stage passengers
				California	Foreign		
Blythe	118, 633	73, 053	337, 225	14, 950	2, 319	2, 324	41, 481
Daggett	48, 625	29, 152	148, 637	1, 172	1, 445	1, 918	33, 945
Fort Yuma	99, 822	60, 965	285, 365	9, 769	1, 469	1, 738	31, 030
Yermo	130, 833	59, 709	367, 269	1, 264	8, 475	2, 642	46, 146
Alturas-New Pine Creek	7, 932	4, 883	19, 063	1, 257	502	367	1, 050
Dorris	44, 267	21, 699	114, 079	1, 054	2, 168	368	2, 209
Hornbrook	88, 997	44, 052	230, 423	2, 400	4, 670	3, 208	52, 805
Malin	10, 167	5, 707	24, 729	448	450	350	1, 045
Redwood Highway	59, 451	32, 702	172, 992	216	3, 353	429	4, 108
Smith River	50, 965	27, 956	141, 033	814	1, 594	801	9, 447

EXHIBIT II.—*Traffic summary, State border quarantine stations, year 1936*—Con.

Stations	Total cars less trucks, locals, and stages	Foreign cars less trucks, locals, and stages	Total passengers less truck, local, and stage passengers	Commercial trucks		Number of stages	Number of stage passengers
				California	Foreign		
Benton [1]	2,669	1,202	6,217	148	224	39	39
Bridgeport [1]	242	137	542	3	5	0	0
Brockway [1]	8,106	3,562	23,690	1,093	845	3	9
Cedarville [1]	120	65	277	47	42	0	0
Chilcoot [1]	7,429	2,250	17,288	23	13	537	1,114
Coleville [1]	17,854	4,099	45,497	359	269	321	1,282
Dog Valley [1]	6,042	510	14,968	409	52	1	16
Eagleville [1]	189	98	465	20	17	0	0
Fort Bidwell [1]	105	55	242	9	8	36	2
Ravendale [1]	4,414	1,546	10,683	121	64	132	465
Stateline [1]	20,734	5,869	47,761	329	291	86	317
Susanville [1]	12,866	3,142	31,806	413	69	183	737
Truckee	110,852	51,549	179,060	4,642	3,485	2,517	35,546
Westgaard Pass [1]	283	111	674	590	25	57	37
Woodfords [1]	1,578	472	4,080	27	87	0	0
Totals	853,175	434,545	2,324,095	41,577	31,941	18,057	262,830

[1] Seasonal stations—In operation during summer months only (for the approximate period May 15 to Oct. 15).

Source: State of California Department of Agriculture, A. A. Brock, Director, Sacramento.

EXHIBIT III.—*Migrants in need of manual employment entering California by motor vehicle, July 1, 1935 to June 30, 1937* [1]

	Total		July 1–Dec. 31, 1935		Jan. 1–June 30, 1936		July 1–Dec. 31, 1936		Jan. 1–June 30, 1937	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
State of origin—all States, excluding California	169,233	100	42,559	100	29,120	100	55,703	100	41,851	100
Percent	100	------	25.2	------	17.2	------	32.9	------	24.7	------
Drought States	142,906	84.44	32,185	75.6	25,005	85.9	48.182	86.5	37,534	89.7
Oklahoma	41,246	24.4	7,561	17.8	6,654	23.0	16,295	29.2	10,696	25.6
Texas	15,752	9.3	3,631	8.5	3,185	10.9	5,119	9.2	3,817	9.1
Arizona	17,113	10.2	3,097	7.3	4,605	15.8	2,724	4.9	6,687	16.0
Arkansas	13,739	8.2	2,866	6.7	2,345	8.1	4,545	8.2	3,983	9.5
Missouri	9,925	5.9	2,426	5.7	1,619	5.6	4,254	7.6	3,426	8.2
Kansas	7,852	4.7	2,238	5.2	891	3.1	3,009	5.4	1,715	4.1
Colorado	5,316	3.2	1,584	3.7	898	3.1	1,351	2.4	1,483	3.5
New Mexico	5,273	3.2	1,578	3.7	1,101	3.8	1,339	2.4	1,255	3.0
Nebraska	5,622	3.4	1,258	2.9	745	2.5	2,274	4.1	1,345	3.2
Idaho	3,482	2.1	1,193	2.8	420	1.4	1,313	2.4	556	1.3
Montana	1,995	1.2	834	2.0	188	.6	781	1.4	192	.5
Utah	2,218	1.4	678	1.6	544	1.9	525	.9	471	1.1
Iowa	2,591	1.6	703	1.7	286	1.0	1,188	2.1	414	1.0
Nevada	1,400	.9	502	1.2	217	.7	397	.7	284	.7
North Dakota	1,754	1.1	532	1.3	107	.4	805	1.4	310	.8
Minnesota	1,491	.9	487	1.1	204	.7	621	1.1	179	.4
South Dakota	2,008	1.2	468	1.1	211	.7	956	1.7	373	.9
Wyoming	1,282	.8	337	.8	290	1.0	448	.8	207	.5
Wisconsin	1,146	.7	212	.5	455	1.6	338	.6	141	.3
Pacific States	15,447	9.1	5,822	13.7	2,576	8.8	4,109	7.4	2,940	7.0
Oregon	10,013	5.9	3,629	8.5	1,768	6.1	2,616	4.7	2,000	4.8
Washington	5,434	3.2	2,193	6.2	808	2.7	1,493	2.7	940	2.2

[1] Data collected by border inspectors of Bureau of Plant Quarantine, California Department of Agriculture.

EXHIBIT III.—*Migrants in need of manual employment entering California by motor vehicle, July 1, 1935 to June 30, 1937*—Continued

	Total		July 1–Dec. 31, 1935		Jan. 1–June 30, 1936		July 1–Dec. 31, 1936		Jan. 1–June 30, 1937	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Industrial States	7,072	4.2	3,106	7.3	922	3.1	2,339	4.2	705	1.7
Illinois	2,109	1.2	818	1.9	306	1.0	760	1.4	225	.5
Michigan	1,610	1.0	658	1.5	230	.8	597	1.1	125	.3
New York	811	.5	486	1.1	74	.3	200	.4	51	.1
Ohio	991	.6	436	1.0	149	.5	319	.6	87	.2
Indiana	881	.5	319	.8	108	.4	336	.6	118	.3
Pennsylvania	453	.3	278	.7	31	.1	75	.1	69	.2
New Jersey	217	.1	111	.3	24	(2)	52	(2)	30	(2)
Southern States	3,341	2.0	1,205	2.8	572	2.0	934	1.6	630	1.5
Tennessee	850	.5	298	.7	132	.5	239	.4	181	.4
Georgia	409	.2	207	.5	78	.3	62	.1	62	.1
Louisiana	430	.3	145	.3	36	.1	144	.3	105	.3
Florida	304	.2	95	.2	87	.3	89	.2	33	(2)
Alabama	324	.2	120	.3	64	.2	89	.1	51	.1
Kentucky	298	.2	101	.2	38	.1	114	.2	45	.1
Mississippi	256	.1	71	.2	88	.3	55	(2)	42	.1
Virginia	96	(2)	57	.1	10	(2)	13	(2)	16	(2)
West Virginia	75	(2)	32	(2)	6	(2)	23	(2)	14	(2)
Maryland	85	(2)	29	(2)	17	(2)	33	(2)	6	(2)
North Carolina	133	(2)	15	(2)	8	(2)	50	(2)	60	.1
District of Columbia	35	(2)	19	(2)	4	(2)	12	(2)	--------	-----
South Carolina	41	(2)	16	(2)	4	(2)	8	(2)	13	(2)
Delaware	5	(2)	--------	-----	--------	-----	3	(2)	2	(2)
New England States	467	.3	241	.6	45	.2	139	.2	42	.1
Massachusetts	214	.1	113	.3	24	(2)	55	(2)	22	(2)
Rhode Island	47	(2)	31	(2)	2	(2)	8	(2)	6	(2)
Maine	40	(2)	40	(2)	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------	-----
Connecticut	115	(2)	36	(2)	15	(2)	52	(2)	12	(2)
Vermont	28	(2)	13	(2)	--------	-----	15	(2)	--------	-----
New Hampshire	23	(2)	8	(2)	4	(2)	9	(2)	2	(2)

---

[2] Less than ⅒ of 1 percent.

EXHIBIT IV.—*Railway companies' estimate of approximate number of transients entering the State of California via trains during the period from May 1937 to October 1937, inclusive*

	State	County of Los Angeles
Santa Fe	27,045	10,381
Union Pacific	18,071	6,415
Southern Pacific	52,407	12,129
Total	97,523	28,925

EXHIBIT V.—*Total number of migrants entering California via border stations for period Aug. 16–31, 1937*

	Cars	Passengers
All States	1,036	4,975
Drought States	730	3,643
Industrial States	30	118
Pacific States	262	1,149
Southern States	12	56
New England States	2	9

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration.

EXHIBIT VI.—*U. S. Department of Labor Employment Service report on migrants "in need of manual employment" (all States) who have entered the State of California by motor vehicles, through border checking stations, for the year 1936*

All States	Cars	Passengers	White		Colored		Mexican		Filipino		Other	
			Single	In family	Single	In family	Single	In family	Single	In family	Single	In family
Jan. 1 to 15	902	3, 989	562	2, 848	8	18	39	203	276	7	----	28
Jan. 16 to 31	1, 282	5, 448	613	4, 291	6	49	25	244	187	17	----	16
Feb. 1 to 15	518	2, 612	210	2, 140	10	23	13	133	65	----	----	18
Feb. 16 to 28	239	1, 188	119	843	78	----	5	44	59	----	----	40
Mar. 1 to 15	548	1, 912	260	1, 463	2	----	11	88	27	18	1	42
Mar. 16 to 31	547	2, 240	278	1, 654	46	15	----	94	30	----	----	123
Apr. 1 to 15	507	2, 485	304	2, 046	7	25	10	60	28	5	----	----
Apr. 16 to 30	677	2, 850	343	2, 258	3	13	23	195	2	5	----	8
May 1 to 15	600	2, 554	380	1, 915	3	26	6	164	44	4	----	12
May 16 to 31	722	2, 970	487	2, 270	11	14	12	145	7	4	----	20
June 1 to 15	641	2, 895	345	2, 296	13	35	5	170	6	----	----	25
June 16 to 30	927	4, 000	492	3, 168	5	86	21	207	5	5	1	10
July 1 to 15	765	3, 594	432	2, 878	6	38	58	158	11	9	----	4
July 16 to 31	1, 000	4, 824	697	3, 714	4	37	41	238	59	16	1	17
Aug. 1 to 15	1, 021	4, 971	719	3, 907	13	69	8	143	20	----	9	83
Aug. 16 to 31	1, 113	5, 643	649	4, 560	----	119	16	142	56	7	1	93
Sept. 1 to 15	1, 351	6, 711	597	5, 721	18	79	12	90	150	11	----	33
Sept. 16 to 30	1, 573	7, 418	884	6, 198	14	77	39	117	43	----	----	46
Oct. 1 to 15	1, 159	5, 353	651	4, 470	6	89	40	72	25	----	----	----
Oct. 16 to 31	1, 880	7, 936	1, 660	5, 657	126	36	47	124	237	17	----	32
Nov. 1 to 15	997	4, 548	656	3, 447	11	47	83	177	122	5	----	----
Nov. 16 to 30	920	4, 344	453	3, 613	6	58	19	107	83	5	----	----
Dec. 1 to 15	725	3, 435	451	2, 816	----	47	----	74	40	7	----	----
Dec. 16 to 31	765	3, 722	487	3, 027	----	45	----	94	60	9	----	----
Total	21, 379	97, 642	12, 729	77, 200	396	1, 045	533	3, 283	1, 642	151	13	650

EXHIBIT VII.—*Summary of out-of-State people (classified as to race) who have entered the State of California during the period Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1937, inclusive, from drought States*

Race	Singles	In families	Total
White	1, 952	14, 285	16, 237
Colored	36	126	162
Mexican	6	273	279
Filipino	57	----	57
Japanese	3	----	3
Other	----	34	34
Total	2, 054	14, 718	16, 772

EXHIBIT VIII.—*Summary of out-of-State people (classified as to race) who have entered the State of California during the period Apr. 1 to June 30, 1937, inclusive, from drought States*

Race	Singles	In families	Total
White	2, 059	17, 629	19, 688
Colored	21	172	193
Mexican	90	768	858
Filipino	12	----	12
Other	----	11	11
Total	2, 182	18, 580	20, 762

Summary for period Jan. 1 to June 30, 1937, inclusive—half-year period

Race	Singles	In families	Total
Jan. 1 to Mar. 31	2,054	14,718	16,772
Apr. 1 to June 30	2,182	18,580	20,762
Grand total, half year 1937	4,236	33,298	37,534

EXHIBIT IX.—*Summary, out-of-State people (classified as to race) who have entered the State of California during the period July 1 to July 31, 1937, inclusive, from drought States*

Race	July 1 to 15			July 16 to 31		
	Singles	In families	Total	Singles	In families	Total
White	309	2,772	3,081	491	2,957	3,448
Colored	10	80	90	9	79	88
Mexican	9	102	111	2	274	276
Filipino	5	4	9	50	5	55
Other		14	14			
Total	333	2,972	3,305	552	3,315	3,867

	July 1 to 31, inclusive, 1937		
	Singles	In families	Total
July 1 to 15, inclusive	333	2,972	3,305
July 16 to 31, inclusive	552	3,315	3,867
Grand total	885	6,287	7,172

EXHIBIT X.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period Jan. 1 to Jan. 31, inclusive, 1937*

	Jan. 1 to 15			Jan. 16 to 31		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	26	18	101	40	23	206
Arkansas	45	11	289	31	3	178
Colorado	17	17	68	27	23	114
Idaho	9	10	35	13	16	28
Iowa	8	13	15	4	5	12
Kansas	18	14	73	11	7	43
Minnesota	2	2	8	1	2	
Missouri	26	18	98	27	14	102
Montana	1	1		5	9	8
Nebraska	25	52	51	27	45	67
Nevada	3		12	1		4
New Mexico	16		85	18	7	82
North Dakota	2		10	2		8
Oklahoma	133	45	701	150	46	776
South Dakota	3	3	10	2	4	
Texas	61	29	286	76	19	390
Utah	17	41	21	13	12	27
Wisconsin	2		9	2	4	6
Wyoming	5	3	9	4	4	6
Total	419	277	1,881	454	243	2,057

Exhibit XI.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period Feb. 1 to 28, inclusive, 1937*

	Feb. 1 to 15			Feb. 16 to 28		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	73	36	330	97	39	513
Arkansas	36	15	197	45	39	233
Colorado	36	50	141	17	34	46
Idaho	7	10	13	10	2	36
Iowa	7	10	14	8	8	39
Kansas	22	27	68	23	13	73
Minnesota	5	3	12	5	10	5
Missouri	24	10	118	40	23	191
Montana	6	5	20	3		14
Nebraska	33	37	99	35	42	90
Nevada	4	4	6	9	5	27
New Mexico	16	13	70	16	9	68
North Dakota	1		6	1		13
Oklahoma	139	27	720	128	150	575
South Dakota	3	4	4	1		5
Texas	69	10	340	69	24	395
Utah	6	4	22	9	14	12
Wisconsin	2		6			
Wyoming	5	6	16	7	7	24
Total	494	271	2, 202	523	419	2, 359

Exhibit XII.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period Mar. 1 to 31, 1937, inclusive*

	Mar. 1 to 15			Mar. 16 to 31		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	80	36	399	62	30	292
Arkansas	70	25	417	58	23	326
Colorado	38	44	120	37	21	126
Idaho	19	31	55	15	7	49
Iowa	19	10	63	10	10	40
Kansas	44	37	147	41	29	158
Minnesota	3	11		8	14	15
Missouri	72	31	392	84	52	444
Montana	5		16	3	6	2
Nebraska	39	29	127	29	41	84
Nevada	5	6	6	2	2	
New Mexico	22	13	117	25	19	97
North Dakota	6	3	22	5	6	15
Oklahoma	171	91	813	199	72	1, 022
South Dakota	12	19	19	19	18	68
Texas	65	46	315	66	16	312
Utah	20	25	44	18	6	62
Wisconsin	3	5	8	3	4	4
Wyoming	6	4	14	3	2	9
Total	699	466	3, 094	687	378	3, 125

Exhibit XIII.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period Apr. 1 to 30, 1937, inclusive*

	Apr. 1 to 15			Apr. 16 to 30		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	62	34	334	127	38	835
Arkansas	99	43	527	63	61	352
Colorado	27	31	85	21	17	79
Idaho	14	4	50	8	1	33
Iowa	7	2	35	4	5	8
Kansas	30	12	126	31	5	124
Minnesota	2	1	13	3	----------	16
Missouri	68	44	295	66	33	323
Montana	2	----------	8	5	4	17
Nebraska	33	41	78	32	41	84
Nevada	7	----------	30	7	2	20
New Mexico	18	2	98	18	15	59
North Dakota	8	5	35	2	5	3
Oklahoma	151	75	752	177	43	958
South Dakota	5	2	16	8	4	26
Texas	42	21	216	32	6	164
Utah	6	6	21	5	16	----------
Wisconsin	1	3	----------	2	7	----------
Wyoming	6	2	22	5	7	9
Total	583	328	2, 741	616	310	3, 110

Exhibit XIV.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period May 1 to 31, 1937, inclusive*

	May 1 to 15			May 16 to 31		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	156	53	768	158	34	880
Arkansas	70	44	370	46	32	235
Colorado	26	20	101	19	15	72
Idaho	12	11	28	15	22	30
Iowa	9	----------	45	4	8	10
Kansas	45	9	202	39	29	144
Minnesota	11	7	30	4	7	5
Missouri	76	51	327	64	39	298
Montana	4	2	12	6	6	10
Nebraska	24	15	70	31	23	74
Nevada	7	4	27	14	12	31
New Mexico	28	6	146	19	9	90
North Dakota	11	8	31	13	8	35
Oklahoma	185	135	824	186	75	992
South Dakota	6	1	26	14	2	53
Texas	59	41	264	57	18	279
Utah	8	11	17	6	9	13
Wisconsin	4	4	10	10	8	23
Wyoming	1	4	--------	3	2	9
Total	742	426	3, 298	708	358	3, 283

EXHIBIT XV.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period June 1 to 30, 1937, inclusive*

	June 1 to 15			June 16 to 30		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	176	143	894	121	75	576
Arkansas	41	9	215	54	41	298
Colorado	35	23	136	26	8	92
Idaho	11	8	32	15	15	30
Iowa	10	21	18	6	5	18
Kansas	50	10	214	34	17	134
Minnesota	1	3		4	4	11
Missouri	58	22	298	39	17	186
Montana	8	1	38	4	1	12
Nebraska	19	20	55	19	15	65
Nevada	18	21	22	9	5	38
New Mexico	28	24	129	20	8	89
North Dakota	12	9	60	8		28
Oklahoma	196	79	1,033	125	45	647
South Dakota	14	12	47	7	9	21
Texas	54	27	312	49	16	271
Utah	12	6	36	10	15	30
Wisconsin	6	7	8	4	3	22
Wyoming	6	4	25	6	14	5
Total	755	449	3,572	560	311	2,576

EXHIBIT XVI.—*Out-of-State people who have entered the State of California from drought States during the period July 1 to 31, inclusive, 1937*

	July 1 to 15			July 16 to 31		
	Cars	Singles	In families	Cars	Singles	In families
Arizona	102	21	537	80	97	348
Arkansas	62	40	334	66	81	347
Colorado	33	27	130	35	37	129
Idaho	20	12	55	21	18	68
Iowa	7	6	23	7	7	26
Kansas	44	40	164	60	20	266
Minnesota	3		13	2	3	
Missouri	52	15	268	48	38	197
Montana	4	6	10	22	25	79
Nebraska	22	9	81	20	14	76
Nevada	9	10	21	8	9	9
New Mexico	24	10	117	36	7	182
North Dakota	9	3	39	7	2	32
Oklahoma	152	96	723	215	112	1,078
South Dakota	11	5	34	7	5	25
Texas	83	15	386	66	32	409
Utah	13	17	23	15	28	19
Wisconsin				8	13	17
Wyoming	4	1	14	4	4	8
Total	333	2,972	3,305	552	3,315	3,867

EXHIBIT XVII.—*Seasonal trend of specified crimes committed in city of Los Angeles February 1936 to August 1937, inclusive*

	Burglary	Robbery	Auto theft	total specified crimes	Total all crimes
1936					
February	154	106	608	868	2, 471
March	671	91	536	1, 298	2, 355
April	602	80	567	1, 249	2, 161
May	522	53	526	1, 101	2, 030
June	488	43	580	1, 111	2, 002
July	446	27	533	1, 006	1, 843
August	454	44	599	1, 097	1, 979
September	565	88	603	1, 256	2, 331
October	589	106	665	1, 360	2, 544
November	624	99	719	1, 442	2, 670
December	717	126	708	1, 551	2, 928
1937					
January	622	104	853	1, 579	2, 938
February	595	144	874	1, 613	2, 999
March	634	120	828	1, 582	2, 922
April	528	118	794	1, 440	2, 638
May	594	100	763	1, 457	2, 618
June	644	99	773	1, 516	2, 607
July	595	102	689	1, 386	2, 514
August	640	94	740	1, 474	2, 825

Persons arrested by Los Angeles Police Department who were sentenced to State prison, also showing the number in Los Angeles County less than 1 year, fiscal years 1935–36 to 1936–37, inclusive

	1935–36			1936–37		
	Number sentenced to State prison	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prison	Number in county less than 1 year	Percentage in county less than 1 year
Homicide	29	2	7	19	7	37
Rape	22	5	23	9	2	22
Robbery	126	46	37	61	24	39
Assault	19	2	11	11	2	18
Burglary	105	38	36	77	20	26
Forgery	56	16	29	53	11	21
Theft	102	32	31	82	20	24
Weapon Act	5	2	40	2	0	0
Sex	20	1	5	11	2	18
State poison	23	3	13	10	5	50
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drunk driving	2			2	1	50
Motor Vehicle Act	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	31	7	23	19	4	21
Total	540	154	29	356	98	28

Persons arrested by Los Angeles Police Department who were sentenced to State prison, also showing the number in the State of California less than 1 year, fiscal years 1935–36 to 1936–37, inclusive

	1935–36			1936–37		
	Number sentenced to State prison	Number in State less than 1 year	Percentage in State less than 1 year	Number sentenced to State prison	Number in State less than 1 year	Percentage in State less than 1 year
Homicide	29	2	7	19	6	32
Rape	22	4	18	9	1	11
Robbery	126	39	31	61	21	34
Assault	19	2	11	11	1	9
Burglary	105	33	31	77	16	21
Forgery	56	12	21	53	8	15
Theft	102	21	12	82	17	21
Weapon Act	5	1	20	2	0	0
Sex	20	1	5	11	2	18
State poison	23	2	9	10	4	40
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drunk driving	2	----------	0	2	1	50
Motor Vehicle Act	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	31	6	19	19	4	21
Total	540	123	23	356	81	23

Exhibit XX.—*Vagrancy-arrest bookings, with previous records, January 1937*

Total vagrancy:	
Number of arrest bookings	1, 326
Number with previous felony records	222
Percentage with felony records	17
Number with misdemeanor records	575
Percentage with misdemeanor records	43
Total with previous records	797
Percentage with previous records	60

Exhibit XXI.—*Arrests by Los Angeles Police Department in which the courts convicted and sentenced on the offense charged, for the month of January 1937*

Offense	Number convicted	Number in county less than 1 year	Percent in county less than 1 year	Number in State less than 1 year	Percent in State less than year
Homicide	2	----------	----------	----------	----------
Rape	5	----------	----------	----------	----------
Robbery	8	5	63	5	63
Assault	18	1	6	1	6
Burglary	34	7	21	7	21
Forgery	27	5	19	4	15
Theft	115	27	23	23	20
Concealed weapons	7	3	43	2	29
Sex	158	36	23	29	18
Nonsupport	8	1	13	1	13
State narcotic	11	2	18	2	18
State Liquor Control Act	1	----------	----------	----------	----------
Drunk driving	136	10	7	10	7
Drunk	3, 612	384	11	287	8
Disorderly conduct	11	1	9	1	9
Vagrancy (except sex)	1, 283	1, 122	87	827	65
Motor Vehicle Act	3	1	33	----------	----------
Municipal ordinance	135	14	10	10	7
Others	214	23	11	16	7
Total	5, 788	1, 642	28	1, 225	23

EXHIBIT XXII

The following table indicates the length of residence in Los Angeles County of persons transported from the Los Angeles County Jail to San Quentin and Folsom Penitentiaries during the fiscal years of 1935–36 and 1936–37:

Length of residence in Los Angeles County	1935–36			1936–37		
	San Quentin	Folsom	Total	San Quentin	Folsom	Total
Less than 1 year	69	44	113	78	36	114
1 to 2 years	20	8	28	26	13	39
2 to 3 years	19	8	27	21	5	26
3 to 4 years	18	9	27	18	8	26
4 to 5 years	17	7	24	10	4	14
5 to 6 years	15	10	25	18	9	27
6 to 7 years	14	5	19	12	6	18
7 to 8 years	11	3	14	16	1	17
8 to 9 years	12	4	16	10	3	13
9 to 10 years	13	7	20	18	5	23
10 years and over	201	83	284	210	88	298
Total	409	188	597	437	178	615

EXHIBIT XXIII.—*Average per-day costs of transient relief*

Average costs of transient relief per individual, per day's care, 1935:
Entire United States, all transient care:

January	$0.72
February	.69
March	.70
April	.70

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer a letter from Mrs. Esther R. Elder, general secretary, city of Pasadena Welfare Bureau, dated September 27, 1940.

(The report referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below:)

CITY OF PASADENA,
DEPARTMENT OF RELIEF AND SOCIAL SERVICE,
Pasadena, Calif. September 27, 1940.

Mr. J. W. ABBOTT.
Secretary, House of Representatives Special Committee
Investigating Interstate Migration,
1639 Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. ABBOTT: I have been requested by the Council of Social Agencies of Pasadena to contact the House of Representatives Special Committee Investigating Interstate Migration and extend to it an expression of our sincere appreciation of its efforts to determine the extent of this problem and some method of controlling it. I am sure we can only reiterate what must have been apparent throughout the entire country; the problem is troublesome, expensive, and causes great suffering.

In the area covered by the Pasadena Community Chest we have had applications from 52 transient families and 50 nonresident families during the past 6 months. This figure seems small compared with the great numbers represented throughout the United States, but, when considered in connection with our very limited funds for private relief, means that it is practically impossible for us to either adequately care for these families or those who would more rightly be considered our responsibility.

The greatest hardship seems to result from the differences in State laws governing the gaining and loss of residence for the purpose of obtaining relief. Most States refuse to extend aid to a citizen after he has been out of the State a year, although it is often necessary for him to reside in a State anywhere from 3 to 9 years in order to gain residence for this purpose. Therefore, there are literally thousands of families who have no residence and for whom no community will assume responsibility. It appears to us from our limited knowledge of the subject that the only adequate solution to this problem would be a unification of all State residence laws with Federal assistance extended to the nonresident individuals for the comparatively short time necessary to put such laws into effect.

If this community can be of any service to the committee in any way please do not hesitate to advise us.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER R. ELDER,
(Mrs.) Esther R. Elder,
General Secretary, Pasadena Welfare Bureau.

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer a letter from Katherine M. Cobb, 739 Garland Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.

(The letter referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The following facts about Los Angeles have been carefully checked. It has been suggested that these be presented for your consideration before the committee hearing in Los Angeles.

Last spring I became interested in writing a personality sketch of Mrs. Arglee Green, who unofficially operates three big charities on faith. She claims to be the only resource for the immediate emergency of women and girls, and women with little children, who might become stranded in Los Angeles. Christ Faith Mission in Highland Park welcomes all women and girls who are in trouble. No questions asked—no case number and no time limit.

In verifying her statement—which I find to be quite true—I have given a careful study to the whole welfare situation, personally contacting the heads of each department, who in turn have referred me to thinking people and civic leaders.

In checking the functions of the various agencies, I find that each is so imbedded in its own problems that no department seems to have any conception of the situation as a whole. In consequence, for emergency cases, they give their clients the runaround, each agency thinking the other can relieve the situation. This runaround is made with distraught nerves, an empty stomach and tired body, and if they have carfare, it is through the kindness of the clerk in charge of the office.

The Community Chest has an appropriation of $3,500,000 to operate its 88 agencies—many of these are welfare, but are character building and have not been planned to meet the necessities of this situation.

This method of charity was outmoded years ago as extravagant and inhuman.

Since when has this code of "Women and children first" been abandoned?

What are we doing to this generation and the one to follow? The strength of a country or a community depends not on its arms but the morale, and that can be no stronger than the honor of its women and the protection of its children.

In a conference with the chief of police, whom I thought could solve this problem. all his department had to offer, was a night in jail on request, at the city's expense, He suggested however, the various agencies, which would normally function in the relief for women and children. Among those listed—Volunteers of Amerida, the Salvation Army, the Minnie Barton Home, Amy McPherson, and the various missions.

Volunteers of America have the Brandon Home—a wonderful place—available through the recommendation of some other agency. Here the guests are permitted to remain indefinitely. Women who have children have to be separated from them as they are taken to another agency.

Minnie Barton Home—this is primarily for offenders and one has to be committed through the probation officer. Occasionally they are admitted on recommendation.

Salvation Army—which in other cities functions for housing women, in this city, has only accommodations for those who can pay.

Amy McPherson—who gives generously of clothing and baskets of food, plans no housing or meals.

I suggested to the chief that a plot of ground be fenced off where these tired, disheartened souls could lie down in peace, unmolested, to starve and die, rather than the alternative.

By immediate relief for women and girls, I mean just that—a meal, housing, with no runabout from one agency to another—but action, some place where, if one should ask any citizen, he could tell them where to go and what to do for a night's shelter and a warm meal. Each citizen, and especially the police officers, should have that answer.

When one considers that this city is the melting pot of humanity with the largest transient population in the world—that the lure of Hollywood calls more women than men—it would seem decent economy to provide against trouble, the kind of trouble that makes hoboes of decent women and forms a scum for the underworld.

The only solution which the city officially offers for this condition is an appeal to the Travelers' Aid, which, under certain circumstances, is authorized to get the client a reduction in a ticket back home—and often there is no home to go to. No allowance can be made for a night's lodging or even a meal. This appeal, if made at all, comes too late, as no one wants to return home on charity as a failure, many are not even in a condition to return.

Among the 40 or more missions—some of which are supported by the Chest, others operating independently—nothing is done for women. The Chest houses 6,000 men nightly.

Inquiring into this strange civic complex, it seems the laws pertaining to the housing of women are more complicated—in fact, the initial expense is greater—they are more of a nuisance. So they let George do it, but he doesn't.

Men are far more able to care for themselves, they can sleep in the parks, crawl under some stairway in a cheap hotel, or they can walk to keep warm. After nightfall, a woman, no matter what she does, is under suspicion, and will be taken up by the police. So it is jail or a brothel.

Just what does happen to the unsophisticated beauty who fails to get recognition, the young business woman who cannot find a job, or the poor woman with little children who has no place to lay her head, all of whom, through no fault of theirs, find themselves stranded in a big city—a friendly city—but one which has made no provision for this emergency.

All these unfortunates have to eat and they have to sleep. Through fear and loneliness, after starving themselves while they pound the pavements to make their pittance hold out, they finally fall the easy victim to some smooth crook who offers them a job which places them in his power. They become B-girls or dancers and singers in the cheap dives, and chambermaids in the low hotels which are merely brothels—or they are lured by the white slaver—the end is inevitable.

A helping hand at some crucial moment to steady them over some rough spot might save much of this misery and its accompanying expense. All this may seem to be the other fellow's worry; however, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer are the unwitting victims, for they foot the bills in costs. These costs are: The night courts for the delinquent and prostitute, hospitalization for malnutrition and tuberculosis, the psychopathic ward for those broken through the strain of fear and worry, and the care of those who contract venereal disease.

Women are fundamentally decent but once their morale is broken, the trend is down, and the end inevitable.

With the many women and girls who either have no job or have one which is intermittent, there should be some place in the central area where they could be housed and fed—bridged over until they can find themselves. There should also be a clubroom, centrally located, where they could come and rest and not have to "move on."

With the morale high the job is easier to find and of a better type. In the survey I find that women can find jobs easier than men. If the city could only see the wisdom of helping these women and girls to keep their chins up—make them feel some faith in life—the whole complexion of this situation would take a different color. It would mean instead of making hoboes out of decent people they would be able to fit into life and be a help to the community.

This survey is respectfully and prayerfully submitted for your consideration. If you can deem me worthy of your time I should appreciate an interview with your committee as a whole, or with your investigator.

KATHARINE M. COBB.

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer a letter dated September 27, 1940, from Joseph Willis, 125 Weller Street, Los Angeles.

(The letter referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *September 27, 1940.*

Congressman TOLAN.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your investigation, may I call to your attention a factor responsible for the scattering of thousands of single men on the road as transients. I refer to the relative needs amendment to the relief act. This amendment has given district Work Projects Administration administrators arbitrary power. It was passed with the sole intent to get rid of single men and has been used against them exclusively. The amendment is vicious in intent and vicious in results. The great engineer who preceded Mr. Roosevelt in office created over a million transients and the policy of Hooverite and Garnerite county politicians has condemned them to a status of perpetual transiency.

In laying off men classified as single transients, local Work Projects Administration district boards put false reasons on the pink slip such as curtailment of activities. The writer has such a slip in his possession and was assured by his Work Projects Administration supervisor this was a false reason and that his place was refilled immediately by a county man recently laid off under the 18-months' regulation.

Any honest person knowing conditions as they are will admit that transients will never get a square deal from counties or States. Federal authorities should handle transients with only Federal personnel in charge. I can furnish detailed information from my own case history that will convince any open-minded person of the truth of the foregoing statements if you are sincerely desirous of remedying existing conditions.

Hoping this epistle will receive your favorable consideration. I am

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH WILLIS.

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer a letter from Eric H. Thomsen, Solvang, Calif., dated September 9, 1940.

(The letter referred to was received and marked as an exhibit and appears below:)

SOLVANG, CALIF., *September 9, 1940.*

Mr. JOHN W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Field Investigator, Congressional Committee on Interstate Migration,
Room 1639, Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. ABBOTT: Thanks for your letter (undated) about the approaching hearings, inviting me to submit in writing any points which seem to me important.

Assuming that, as a matter of course, men like Dr. Paul Taylor, of the University in Berkeley, Dr. Omer Mills, Mr. John Henderson, and Mr. Robert Hardie of the Farm Security Administration will be present to testify, I shall confine myself to points which they may not be apt to cover. I shall venture, furthermore, to write as one who was acquainted with the program of the Resettlement Administration as one of its assistant regional directors who has since kept in touch with the migrant problem as a free lance. As such a one I see a few things which may be worth pointing out:

1. Regardless of Federal and State efforts and in spite of the very real but very limited service rendered by the increasingly useful Farm Security Administration migratory labor camps, the migrants are still, by and large, homeless and jobless, a dependable source of cheap labor.

2. Even the best-intentioned efforts have approached the problem one-sidedly and to that extent failed, less because of what has been attempted than because of what has been ignored.

3. The whole migrant situation has changed rapidly and radically. The tendency is no longer to settle in squatter camps, but to attempt home ownership on an inadequate basis. I am tempted to predict that no attempt will be wholly effective which does not tackle the migrant problem as that of potential communities with a multitude of facets which will need to be considered simultaneously.

4. Outside of the Federal camps, which cover at best 5 percent of the migrant population of California, such a community approach has not been made. Even within the camp program it cannot best be made as long as the problem is left entirely with specialists, riding each his own hobby to the exclusion of everything else, the whole background heavy with the clouds of partisan emotions.

5. That a desirable outcome requires the willingness, ability, and freedom of individuals to aid the migrants to work out their own solutions. Such a program would begin in recognition of the human factor as the key to proper solutions,

and would then pass on toward desirable social goals by means of appropriate, nonviolent means.

After having worked both within the Government program and outside of it as an interested free lance, I have personally come to conclude that the migrant problem will not be solved until the migrants are enabled to do for themselves that which most needs to be done.

Attention has already been called to the fact that the migrants are trying to settle down as fast as possible. On the outskirts of towns in major work areas deficient communities keep shooting up like toadstools. If these inadequate, overnight attempts at permanent residence are not to become rural slums, it is vitally important that the migrants be enabled to function under leadership of their own toward a full and complete community life. To this end there should be a considerable number of local training centers in the vicinity of such new settlements for the purpose of training local leadership and promoting community participation and integration.

The following examples will indicate some of the areas of recognized needs: To know sound principles and effective techniques of community organization; the history, philosophy, and practice of cooperation; recent labor trends; the growth and aims of labor unions together with methods of organization. A working knowledge of State legislation concerning labor, public health, public welfare, housing and immigration, together with practice in negotiation and arbitration, public speaking and journalism. Civics in the sense of acquiring a practical knowledge of parliamentary procedure, common law, the functions of government, the history of American civilization, the fundamentals of citizenship, and recent social trends.

Indispensable other means to sound community organization and home management are general competence in the planning, preparation, and preservation of food; clothes making; household budgeting; consumers education; first aid; the methods of preventing communicable and occupational disease; the principles of personal, home, and community hygiene (including preparation for marriage, home nursing, birth control, prenatal, infant, and child care), mental hygiene, and the principles of heredity. Sound principles of recreation and the ability to formulate and develop satisfactory community programs. Knowledge of the history and function of religion in relation to personal needs and social problems.

Other vocational needs, say in relation to agriculture, construction, home industries, and mechanical skills would very likely be added in those community centers where these needs became most pronounced and proved most capable of fulfillment.

By the very nature of government enterprise, its ways are too slow and cumbersome to function in these fields as quickly as the needs arise. On the other hand nothing short of the authority and capacity of the Federal Government would have been allowed a chance to function, even in such a limited manner as the Federal Security Administration camps now function. Though much of the work which still needs to be done, could be accomplished as a matter of practical coordination of the resources and efforts now operating within various governmental agencies, it is doubtful, in the light of past experience, whether the inevitable red tape of governmental procedure and overlapping authority (not to mention the conflicting personal ambitions or prejudices of individual Government employees, high and low) will permit those things which most need to be done to be done, as and when they should be done.

There is a wide field here for private enterprise. If nothing much is being done about it, it has usually been because those who could see the need, had no access to the indispensable minimum finances involved, and those who could command the financial support, either could not see the need or, for reasons of their own, did not intend that anything should be done about it. Which brings us back, for all I know, to the question whether in this, as in other general aspects of the whole problem of interstate migration and destitute citizens, anything short of Federal effort will avail.

I hope this statement will be found within the scope of your inquiry and not too lengthy to be considered.

With personal greetings to your chief investigator, my former colleague in Government service, Dr. E. J. Rowell, and thanks for the opportunity to submit these personal reflections.

Sincerely yours,

Eric H. Thomsen.

Mr. ABBOTT. I offer copies of six State legislative bills dealing with relief.

(The documents referred to were received and marked as exhibits and are reprinted below:)

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 980

Introduced by Mr. Redwine (by request), January 24, 1935; referred to committee on governmental efficiency and economy

An act to add sections 717, 718, 719, and 720 to the Political Code, relating to State police.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 717 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"717. State police officers shall be stationed at all points where a highway crosses the border of the State and in all unincorporated towns within the State which are situated at or near the border of the State. If any State agency maintains an inspection force at any such point, the officer or officers comprising such force may be sworn in as State police, at the discretion of the chief."

SEC. 2. Section 718 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"718. State police officers shall be detailed to, and shall police all State buildings and grounds, the University of California and its branches, all State parks, and all places of public resorts not adequately policed by local officers."

SEC. 3. Section 719 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"719. A State detective bureau shall be formed and operated under the direction of a chief. It shall consist of not more than fifteen officers, five to be stationed at San Francisco, five at Los Angeles, and five at San Diego. The detective bureau shall assist in the enforcement of all laws of a general nature and shall cooperate with the Division of Criminal Identification and Investigation in the Department of Penology."

SEC. 4. Section 720 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"720. The chief of the State police and all State police officers are hereby designated as law enforcement officers within the meaning of section 21 of Article V of the Constitution of the State of California, and as such are under the direct supervision of the Attorney General."

(Amended in Senate June 6, 1935; amended in assembly May 30, 1935)

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 2459

Introduced by Messrs. Redwine and Jones, May 16, 1935; referred to committee on unemployment

An act to prevent the entry into California of paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons, persons likely to become public charges, providing means for enforcing the same and prescribing penalties for the violation thereof, declaring the urgency thereof, and providing it shall take effect immediately

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Large numbers of paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons and persons likely to become public charges have been, and are, coming into this State, burdening the relief rolls, creating further unemployment in the State, and subjecting our workers to competition with pauper labor. This influx of unemployed and unemployables at the present time seriously threatens the safety and welfare of the people of this State, and, if continued, will destroy the State. In order to protect this State and the people thereof from pauper labor; also to save this State and its people from impossible financial burdens in caring for vast numbers of paupers and indigent persons; also to preserve the public peace, health, and safety; also to preserve the standard of living of the people of this State and to maintain the general welfare and to protect and defend this State, it is imperatively necessary that hereafter no paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons or persons likely to become public charges, shall be allowed to enter or shall enter this State.

Sec. 2. All paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons are hereby prohibited from entering the State of California.

Sec. 3. It is hereby made the duty of the Governor of this State to enforce the provisions and purposes of this act by the means herein provided and by any other means that he may find necessary to enforce the same. He is hereby authorized and directed to use all means that may be necessary to enforce this act. He is also authorized to cooperate with the United States of America in all ways looking towards the effectuating of the purposes of this act.

Sec. 4. Every person whose right to enter the State of California is in question must affirmatively establish that he is not one of the persons excluded from entry under the terms of this act; the burden of proof shall be upon each such person.

Sec. 5. The Governor is hereby authorized and directed to use, in his discretion, any present agency, officers or officials of the State, and, if he deems it necessary or expedient, to create such new agency or agencies and employ such personnel as may be necessary to adequately enforce this act. He may also use the officers and officials of any county, city and county, city, or other municipal corporation in the enforcement of this act.

Sec. 5½. *The Governor is authorized and directed to in every practicable way carry into effect all of the provisions of this act and to that end may set up and maintain at State lines on major or other highways, under the jurisdiction of any department of the State designated by him, either temporary or permanent offices, stations, or bureaus, for the identification of persons and the inspection of motor vehicle or vehicles and to supervise and direct the use of the highway or highways by the person or persons, vehicle or vehicles, entering the State.*

Sec. 6. It shall be the duty of the Governor, either personally or through such official as he may designate for that purpose, to make and enforce all rules and regulations that may be necessary to carry out and enforce the purposes of this act. All such rules and regulations shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State and shall be effective from the date of such filing. The Governor may likewise alter such rules and regulations from time to time. Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act or any of the rules and regulations so promulgated shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars ($500) or imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one (1) year, or both such fine and imprisonment; in addition any person so convicted who fails to establish that he was a bona fide resident of the State of California at the date of the approval of this act shall be summarily deported from the State of California.

Sec. 7. If any section, subsection, clause or phrase of this act is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, such decisions shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act. The Legislature hereby declares that it would have passed this act irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences or clauses or phrases thereof be declared unconstitutional.

If in any action, suit or proceeding it be adjudged that any provision of this act is unconstitutional as applied to the particular facts involved in such action, suit or proceeding, any judgment or decision rendered therein shall not affect the application of the provisions of this act in any other action, case, suit or proceeding.

Sec. 8. This act is passed to meet the emergency herein recited and shall remain in force only until February 1, 1937.

Sec. 9. Should any person enter the State of California in violation of the terms of this act, then upon the discovery of such person at any place in this State he shall be summarily deported from this State.

Sec. 10. This act is hereby declared to be an urgency measure within the meaning of section 1 of Article IV of the Constitution and necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety and shall take effect immediately.

The facts constituting such necessity are as follows:

There exists in the State of California, in the United States and throughout the world a grave economic depression. Many persons have long wanted to live in California and now finding themselves without employment and without means of support in their fixed place of residence they have been and are moving to California in large numbers. There are hundreds of thousands of employable persons now within this State, most of whom are California citizens and who have no employment and who, together with their families, are now being maintained at public expense. In addition, today there are also hundreds of thousands of unemployed persons in this State who are not maintained by the public, but for whom no employment is available. There are also tens of thousands of unemployable persons in this State who are now being maintained at public expense.

Vast numbers of paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons and persons likely to become public charges have been and are coming into this State, burdening the relief rolls, creating further unemployment in the State, subjecting our workers to competition with pauper labor, and threatening the continued prosperity, health, safety and welfare of the people of this State. The entry into this State of unemployed persons who do not have sufficient means to support themselves results in large numbers of such persons being maintained at the expense of this State, or in the cases in which such persons obtain employment they displace workers already employed in California and the displaced workers and their families are forced upon public relief. If the influx of destitute unemployed continues it will be impossible to provide the sums necessary for relief or to provide employment for the increased numbers of jobless persons. The coming of large numbers of persons of the classes mentioned threatens the peace and safety of the State and it is imperative that no more paupers, vagabonds, indigent persons or persons likely to become public charges, shall enter or be permitted to enter this State.

(Amended in assembly March 31, 1939)

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1356

Introduced by Mr. Houser, January 23, 1939; referred to Committee on Social Service and Welfare

An act to prevent the entry into the State of California of paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice, providing for enforcement of this act and prescribing penalties for the violation thereof

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Large numbers of paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice have, and unless restrained will continue to, come into this State, and have created a problem of relief and law enforcement. This influx of such persons is detrimental to the best interests of this State and this statute is enacted in the exercise of the police power of this State as a matter of self-preservation, and to prevent the overburdening of facilities of the State for the relief of destitution and for law enforcement.

The Legislature hereby declares that the enactment and enforcement of this act is essential to the welfare of the people of this State.

SEC. 2. All paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice are hereby prohibited from entering the State of California.

For the purposes of this act a pauper is a person who is likely to become a public charge within three years.

SEC. 3. The Governor of this State shall enforce the provisions of this act in the manner provided in this act or by any other means or methods available. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Governor is authorized to cooperate with any agency of the United States of America or of any other State of the United States.

SEC. 4. The Governor is hereby authorized to use, in his discretion, any department, board, commission, officer, or other agency of the State to enforce this act; and he may create any additional agency which, in his discretion, he finds necessary to carry out the provisions and to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. The Governor shall make and enforce all rules and regulations necessary to enforce this act. Such rules and regulations shall be filed with the Secretary of State and shall be effective from and after date of such filing.

SEC. 6. The Governor shall provide for the establishment of inspection points within this State and on each highway, road, or railroad entering this State; and he shall provide for inspection of all persons entering this State by boat, airplane, or any other method.

SEC. 7. Any person authorized by the Governor to inspect prospective entrants into this State is hereby authorized to examine *under oath* such prospective entrants for the purpose of determining whether such prospective entrants are paupers, vagabonds, or fugitives from justice. Any person may be restrained from entering this State if the person so authorized reasonably determines that he is a pauper, vagabond, or fugitive from justice.

SEC. 8. Every person whose right to enter this State is questioned must affirmatively establish that he is not a person whose entry is prohibited under the provisions of this act.

Any person who has been refused the right to enter the State of California as herein provided shall have the right to bring a proceeding in the superior court of the county which he was prohibited from entering to test the validity of his exclusion. The defendant in said suit shall be the Attorney General of the State of California, whose duty it shall be to defend the same. Process shall be served upon said Attorney General, who shall make answer within ten days after the same is served upon him.

Said suit shall be heard and determined as soon as the convenience of the court will permit. The burden of proof shall be upon the plaintiff to establish affirmatively that he is not a person whose entry into this State is prohibited by the provisions of this act.

Sec. 9. Any person who enters the State of California in violation of this act is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sec. 10. Should any person enter the State of California in violation of the terms of this act, then upon the discovery of such person at any place in this State he shall be summarily deported from this State.

Sec. 11. If any section, subsection, clause, or phrase of this act is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act. The Legislature hereby declares that it would have passed this act irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences or clauses or phrases thereof be declared unconstitutional.

If in any action, suit, or proceeding it be adjudged that any provision of this act is unconstitutional as applied to the particular facts involved in such action, suit, or proceeding, any judgment or decision rendered therein shall not affect the application of the provisions of this act in any other action, suit, or proceeding.

Assembly Bill No. 47

CHAPTER 47

An act to amend sections 124, 127, 3591, 3594, 3616, 3651, 3659, 3661, 3691, 3807, 4101, 4111, 4112, 4113, and 4147 of, to amend the title of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of Division I of, to repeal sections 3614, 3707, and 4108 of, to add sections 3511.5, 3521, 3662, and 3663 to, to add Chapter 4.3, consisting of sections 3534 to 3562, and Chapter 4.6, consisting of sections 3571 to 3578, to Part 6 of Division I of the Revenue and Taxation Code, and to amend sections 3833.3, 3857.2, and 3859.20 of, to repeal sections 3773.1, 3833, and 3859.18 of, and to add sections 3773.1, 3773.2, 3785.4, 3785.5, and 3785.6 to, and to add Chapter IXb, consisting of sections 3860.01 to 3860.32, and Chapter IXc, consisting of sections 3861.1 to 3861.8, to Title IX of Part III of, the Political Code, relating to property taxation, including the right of redemption and the classification and control of tax-deeded property, and making an appropriation

[Approved by Governor June 1, 1940. Filed with Secretary of State June 4, 1940]

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. Section 124 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"124. 'Current taxes' means taxes which are a lien on property but which are not included in 'amount of sold taxes' except that between a lien date and the time in the same calendar year when property is sold to the State for taxes the taxes becoming a lien on this lien date in such calendar year are not yet 'current taxes'."

Sec. 1.5. Section 127 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"127. 'Tax-deeded property' is property which has been deeded to the State for taxes and which has not been sold to a private purchaser or a taxing agency and has not been finally classified as suitable for public use."

Sec. 2. Section 3511.5 is hereby added to the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read as follows:

"3511.5. On execution of the deed to the State the right of redeption is terminated."

Sec. 3. Section 3521 is hereby added to the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read as follows:

"3521. A proceeding based on an alleged invalidity or irregularity of any deed to the State for taxes or of any proceedings leading up to the deed can only be commenced within one year after the date of recording of the deed to the State in the county recorder's office or within one year after section 3785.4 of the Political Code takes effect, whichever is later."

Sections 351 to 358, inclusive, of the Code of Civil Procedure do not apply to the time within which a proceeding may be brought under the provisions of this section.

Sec. 4. Chapter 4.3, consisting of sections 3534 to 3562, is hereby added to Part 6 of Division I of the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 4.3. CLASSIFICATION OF TAX-DEEDED PROPERTY

"3534. The Land Classification Commission is continued in existence. There shall be three commissioners, who shall be appointed by the Governor, to serve at his pleasure, one of whom shall be learned in the subject of agricultural economics, one of whom shall be learned in the subject of real property taxation, and one of whom shall be learned in the subject of conservation and regional planning.

"3535. The chief of the redemption tax department in the Controller's office, or any other civil service employee of the classifying agency designated by the classifying agency, shall act as secretary of the Land Classification Commission.

"3538. The chairman of the Land Classification Commission shall be elected by and serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall be a member of the commission. The chairman and members of the commission shall each receive their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the course of their duties under this chapter and shall each receive a sum to be fixed by the State Personnel Board and which the State Personnel Board may from time to time change as compensation for each and every day devoted to the actual performance of their duties under this chapter.

"3539. The classifying agency shall, from its personnel, furnish any secretarial, clerical, technical, or other assistance as may be needed by the Land Classification Commission.

"3540. Until the Land Classification Commission is appointed and qualified, the classifying agency shall exercise the powers and duties conferred upon the Land Classification Commission.

"3541. 'Administering agency' means the State or local agency which administers tax-deeded property which has been classified as suitable for a public use. The administering agency may be any State department, commission, board, or other State agency, or may be a county, city, district, or other local agency.

"3542. 'Classifying agency' means the Controller, or such State agency as he may designate.

"3543. After the deeds to the State are received in the Controller's office, or after the right of redemption is terminated, whichever is later, the classifying agency shall, as prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, tentatively classify each parcel of tax-deeded property so as to indicate the best use for each parcel.

"3544. This tentative classification shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

"(a) Which property is suitable for public use, and what the public use should be.

"(b) Which property is suitable to go back to private ownership.

"(c) Which property appears to be essentially waste land not fit for either public or private use with recommendations for its rehabilitation.

"3545. When the tentative classification is completed, the classifying agency shall notify the various State or local agencies which in its judgment are best fitted to administer the property classified for public use. As prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, each State or local agency so notified shall notify the classifying agency whether or not it desires to become the administering agency for such property.

"3546. As prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, any State or local agency may apply to the classifying agency:

"(a) To have tax-deeded property classified for public use.

"(b) To be the administering agency for property classified for public use.

"3547. As prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, the classifying agency shall transmit to the Land Classification Commission the tentative classification, the responses of the State or local agencies to its notifications, any requests of State or local agencies relating to classification, and its recommendations for the final classification.

"3548. The Land Classification Commission, under such rules as it may prescribe, shall establish a final classification of property which has been deeded to the State for taxes. This final classification shall include, but is not limited to, the same subjects as the tentative classification.

"3549. No property shall be finally classified for public use unless some State or local agency has indicated its willingness to become the administering agency for the property. If no agency desires property otherwise suitable for public use, it shall be finally classified for private ownership or as waste land.

"3550. Until final classification is completed, tax-deeded property is subject to rental but not to sale, except that it may be sold under Chapter 8 of Part 6 of this division.

"3551. Not more than 5 percent of the assessed valuation of property in any county shall be finally classified as suitable for public use, except by consent of the board of supervisors. As used in this section, 'assessed valuation' means the assessed valuation of all taxable property and the valuation which would be placed on tax-deeded property, and on former tax-deeded property which has been classified for public use, if such property were assessed. On information furnished by the county assessor, the assessed valuation shall be determined by the Land Classification Commission as of each time final classification is made.

"3552. After tax-deeded property has been finally classified as to use, the property classified for private ownership is subject to sale and continues to be subject to rental in the manner provided by law.

"3554. After tax-deeded property has been finally classified as to use, the property classified for public use and the waste land is not subject to sale to private owners.

"3555. The property finally classified for public use shall be administered by the State or local agency which consents to administer the property and which, in the judgment of the Land Classification Commission, is best fitted to administer the property. The administering agency shall enter on administration of the property in the manner and at the time prescribed by the Land Classification Commission.

"3556. Before taking over the property for purposes of administration, the administering agency shall agree with the board of supervisors as to the purchase price to be paid for the property and any terms of sale. This purchase price shall not exceed the amount which would have been necessary to redeem the property at the time it was deeded to the State for taxes. This price shall be paid from any funds appropriated or given to the administering agency. If the administering agency is the county, the board of supervisors shall agree with the governing bodies of all revenue districts as to the amount to be paid to such revenue districts by the county. On consummation of any agreement under this section, the property classified for public use ceases to be subject to rental. The money received under this section shall be distributed in the same manner as money received on sale of tax-deeded property to a private purchaser.

"3557. If agreement is not reached within a time set by the Land Classification Commission as to the amount to be paid or the terms of sale for property finally classified for public use, any property classified for public use may be immediately reclassified as if it had not been previously classified.

"3558. The administering agency may also agree to purchase the rights of other taxing agencies.

"3559. If the Controller has not authorized sale of property finally classified for private ownership, or if no agreement has been consummated regarding the purchase price and terms of sale for property finally classified for public use, such property may be reclassified at any time in the manner and at the time prescribed by the Land Classification Commission.

"3560. The property finally classified as waste land continues to be subject to rental and shall be administered by the classifying agency or such agency as it may designate. When, in the judgment of the Land Classification Commission, this waste land is rehabilitated, it shall be reclassified as to private or public use in the same manner as tax-deeded property being classified for the first time.

"3561. At any time, all State and local agencies shall supply all information requested by the classifying agency or the Land Classification Commission.

"3562. Any money necessary for carrying out the provisions of this chapter shall be appropriated only out of the tax deeded land rental fund. This section is not an appropriation, but only prescribes the fund out of which appropriations are to be made by other provisions of law for the purposes of this chapter."

SEC. 5. Chapter 4.6, consisting of sections 3571 to 3578, inclusive, is hereby added to Part 6 of Division I of the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 4.6. TERMINATING RIGHT OF REDEMPTION

"3571. The right of redemption of property which was deeded to the State before the effective date of section 3785.4 of the Political Code shall be terminated under this chapter.

"3572. Within one year after the effective date of Chapter IXc of Title IX of Part III of the Political Code, or within six months after default under any plan for payment of delinquent taxes in installments, whichever is later, the tax collector shall send a notice of termination of right of redemption by registered mail to the last assessee of every assessment of tax-deeded property which was deeded to the State before the effective date of section 3785.4 of the Political Code. The notice need not be mailed if the last assessee files with the tax collector a waiver of the notice.

"3573. The notice of termination of right of redemption shall state:

"(a) The time of termination of the right of redemption;

"(b) A description of the property;

"(c) That if the property is not redeemed, or payment of delinquent taxes in installments is not started, before the time set for termination of the right of redemption, the right of redemption will cease.

"3574. The tax collector may also publish the notice of termination of right of redemption once in a newspaper published in the county, or, if none, by posting in three conspicuous places in the county.

"3575. The time set for the termination of the right of redemption shall be four months after the notice of termination of the right of redemption is sent.

"3576. If any property is not redeemed, or payment of delinquent taxes in installments is not started, before the time set for termination of the right of redemption, the right of redemption as to such property is terminated.

"3577. Failure of the tax collector to send the notice of termination of the right of redemption within the time limited in this chapter does not affect the validity of the termination of the right of redemption within the proper time after the notice is actually sent. The tax collector shall be liable for any damages suffered by the county or State because of his failure to send the notice within the time limited in this chapter.

"3578. When the right of redemption of any property is terminated under this chapter, and the property is classified for public use, the minimum price which the administering agency shall pay to the county is the cost of mailing and publishing the notice of termination of right of redemption."

Sec. 5.3. Section 3591 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3591. As used in this chapter "redemptioner" means any person entitled to redeem real property from tax sale, or who would be so entitled if the right of redemption were not terminated."

Sec. 6. Section 3594 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3594. As prescribed in this chapter, the State may quiet its title to tax-deeded property."

Sec. 7. Section 3614 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby repealed.

Sec. 8. Section 3616 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3616. This invalidity redemption shall be made within one year after the interlocutory decree establishing the invalidity becomes a final judgment."

Sec. 8.1. Section 3651 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3651. After the recording of the deed to the State, the State has exclusive power through the Controller to rent tax deeded property and to receive all proceeds arising in any manner from the property except proceeds from a sale of a parcel of tax deeded property."

Sec. 8.2. Section 3659 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3659. All moneys received by the Controller under this chapter and section 3441 shall be placed in the tax deeded land rental fund in the State treasury, which fund is continued in existence, and shall not be deducted from the amount necessary to be paid in redemption of the property."

Sec. 8.3 Section 3661 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3661. The Legislature hereby declares that it is the policy of this State to use any revenues received by the State from the administration of tax sold or tax deeded property for the primary purpose of restoring tax deeded property to the rolls and for all other purposes incident to the administration and classification of tax sold property and tax deeded property and such revenues are hereby appropriated for the purposes specified in this section. No money shall be appropriated from the tax deeded land rental fund except for the purposes specified in this section. Any unencumbered balance in excess of $5,000 remaining in the tax deeded land rental fund on June 30th of each fiscal year shall be transferred to the general fund."

SEC. 8.4. Section 3662 is hereby added to the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read as follows:

"3662. The advisory committee on tax deeded property is continued in existence. The committee consists of six members, appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Controller, and holding office at the pleasure of the Governor. Three members of this committee shall represent the interests of the counties of this State and three members shall represent the interests of the cities of this State. The members of this committee serve without compensation, except that they shall each receive the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the course of their duties."

SEC. 8.5. Section 3663 is hereby added to the Revenue and Taxation Code, to read as follows:

"3663. The advisory committee on tax deeded property shall meet on call of the Controller for the purpose of conference and making recommendations in regard to:

"(a) Restoring tax deeded property to the rolls;

"(b) All other purposes relating to the administration of tax sold property and tax deeded property."

SEC. 9. Section 3691 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3691. As provided in this chapter, after final classification of tax deeded property has been completed, the tax collector may sell all or any portion of tax deeded property for lawful money of the United States, except where the property has been classified as waste land."

SEC. 10. Section 3707 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. The title of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of Division I of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 8. DEED TO STATE, COUNTY OR PUBLIC AGENCIES"

SEC. 12. Section 3807 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3807. The deed conveys to the purchaser all the State's interest in the property."

SEC. 13. Section 4101 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4101. Until the right of redemption is terminated, tax sold property may be redeemed by the redemptioner. The 'redemptioner' is the person whose estate has been sold or his successor in interest."

SEC. 14. Section 4108 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. Section 4111 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4111. Without charge, the auditor shall note in the delinquent list the fact and date of redemption."

SEC. 16. Section 4112 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4112. On redemption, any interest acquired by virtue of the sale to the State ceases."

SEC. 17. Section 4113 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4113. Whenever tax sold property is redeemed, the redemptioner or any other person claiming through him may bring suit against the State to quiet title to all or any portion of the property and prosecute it to final judgment."

SEC. 18. Section 4147 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4147. As provided in this chapter, any parcel of tax sold property contained in an assessment and having a separate valuation on the roll for the year of sale to the State and all subsequent rolls may be redeemed separately from the whole assessment."

SEC. 19. Section 3785.4 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"3785.4. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3780, 3817 or 3818, or any other section of this code, the right to redeem property which has been sold to the State for taxes is terminated on execution of the deed to the State under section 3785."

SEC. 20. Section 3785.5 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"3785.5. A proceeding based on an alleged invalidity or irregularity of any deed to the State for taxes or of any proceedings leading up to the deed can only be commenced within one year after the date of recording of the deed to the State in the county recorder's office or within one year after this section takes effect, whichever is later. Sections 351 to 358, inclusive, of the Code of Civil Procedure do not apply to the time within which a proceeding may be brought under the provisions of this section."

SEC. 21. Section 3785.6 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"3785.6. Tax deeded property is property which has been deeded to the State for taxes and which has not been sold to a private purchaser or a taxing agency and has not been finally classified as suitable for public use."

SEC. 22. Section 3833 of the Political Code is hereby repealed.

SEC. 23. Section 3833.3 of the Political Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3833.3. After final classification of tax deeded property has been completed, the tax collector shall, whenever directed by the board of supervisors of his county, and upon the written authorization of the State Controller, sell all or any portion of tax deeded property at public auction to the highest bidder for cash in lawful money of the United States except where the tax deeded property has been classified as waste land."

SEC. 24. Chapter IXb, consisting of sections 3860.01 to 3860.32, inclusive, is hereby added to Title IX of Part III of the Political Code, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER IXB. CLASSIFICATION OF TAX DEEDED PROPERTY

"3860.01. A Land Classification Commission is hereby created. There shall be three commissioners who shall be appointed by the Governor to serve at his pleasure, one of whom shall be learned in the subject of agricultural economics, one of whom shall be learned in the subject of real property taxation, and one of whom shall be learned in the subject of conservation and regional planning.

"3860.05. The chief of the redemption tax department in the Controller's office, or any other civil service employee of the classifying agency designated by the classifying agency, shall act as secretary of the Land Classification Commission.

"3860.07. The Governor shall make the first appointments to the Land Classification Commission within ninety days after this chapter takes effect. Failure to make the appointments within the proper time does not invalidate the appointments when actually made.

"3860.08. The chairman of the Land Classification Commission shall be elected by and serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall be a member of the commission. The chairman and members of the commission shall each receive their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the course of their duties under this chapter, and shall each receive a sum to be fixed by the State Personnel Board, and which the State Personnel Board may from time to time change, as compensation for each and every day devoted to the actual performance of their duties under this chapter.

"3860.09. The classifying agency shall, from its personnel, furnish any secretarial, clerical, technical, or other assistance as may be needed by the Land Classification Commission.

"3860.10. Until the Land Classification Commission is appointed and qualified, the classifying agency shall exercise the powers and duties conferred upon the Land Classification Commission.

"3860.11. 'Administering agency' means the State or local agency which administers tax deeded property which has been classified as suitable for a public use. The administering agency may be any State department, commission, board, or other State agency, or may be a county, city, district, or other local agency.

"3860.12. 'Classifying agency' means the Controller, or such State agency as he may designate.

"3860.13. After the deeds to the State are received in the Controller's office, or after the right of redemption is terminated, whichever is later, the classifying agency shall, as prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, tentatively classify each parcel of tax deeded property so as to indicate the best use for each parcel.

"3860.14. This tentative classification shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

"(a) Which property is suitable for public use, and what the public use should be;

"(b) Which property is suitable to go back to private ownership;

"(c) Which property appears to be essentially waste land not fit for either public or private use with recommendations for its rehabilitation.

"3860.15. When the tentative classification is completed, the classifying agency shall notify the various State or local agencies which in its judgment are best fitted to administer the property classified for public use. As prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, each State or local agency so notified shall notify the classifying agency whether or not it desires to become the administering agency for such property.

"3860.16. As prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, any State or local agency may apply to the classifying agency:

"(a) To have tax-deeded property classified for public use;

"(b) To be the administering agency for property classified for public use.

"3860.17. As prescribed by the Land Classification Commission, the classifying agency shall transmit to the Land Classification Commission the tentative classification, the responses of the State or local agencies to its notifications, any requests of State or local agencies relating to classification, and its recommendations for the final classification.

"3860.18. The Land Classification Commission, under such rules as it may prescribe, shall establish a final classification of property which has been deeded to the State for taxes. This final classification shall include, but is not limited to, the same subjects as the tentative classification.

"3860.19. No property shall be finally classified for public use unless some State or local agency has indicated its willingness to become the administering agency for the property. If no agency desires property otherwise suitable for public use, it shall be finally classified for private ownership or as waste land.

"3860.20. Until final classification is completed, tax-deeded property is subject to rental but not to sale, except that it may be sold under section 3897d.

"3860.21. Not more than 5 percent of the assessed valuation of property in any county shall be finally classified as suitable for public use, except by consent of the board of supervisors. As used in this section 'assessed valuation' means the assessed valuation of all taxable property and the valuation which would be placed on tax-deeded property, and on former tax-deeded property which has been classified for public use, if such property were assessed. On information furnished by the county assessor, the assessed valuation shall be determined by the Land Classification Commission as of each time final classification is made.

"3860.22. After tax-deeded property has been finally classified as to use, the property classified for private ownership is subject to sale and continues to be subject to rental in the manner provided by law.

"3860.24. After tax-deeded property has been finally classified as to use, the property classified for public use and the waste land is not subject to sale to private owners.

"3860.25 The property finally classified for public use shall be administered by the State or local agency which consents to administer the property and which, in the judgment of the Land Classification Commission, is best fitted to administer the property. The administering agency shall enter on administration of the property in the manner and at the time prescribed by the Land Classification Commission.

"3860.26. Before taking over the property for purposes of administration, the administering agency shall agree with the board of supervisors as to the purchase price to be paid for the property and any terms of sale. This purchase price shall not exceed the amount which would have been necessary to redeem the property at the time it was deeded to the State for taxes. This price shall be paid from any funds appropriated or given to the administering agency. If the administering agency is the county, the board of supervisors shall agree with the governing bodies of all revenue districts as to the amount to be paid to such revenue districts by the county. On consummation of any agreement under this section, the property classified for public use ceases to be subject to rental. The money received under this section shall be distributed in the same manner as money received on sale of tax-deeded property to a private purchaser.

"3860.27. If agreement is not reached within a time set by the Land Classification Commission as to the amount to be paid or the terms of sale for property finally classified for public use, any property classified for public use may be immediately reclassified as if it had not been previously classified.

"3860.28. The administering agency may also agree to purchase the rights of other taxing agencies.

"3860.29. If the Controller has not authorized sale of property finally classified for private ownership, or if no agreement has been consummated regarding the purchase price and terms of sale for property finally classified for public use, such property may be reclassified at any time in the manner and at the time prescribed by the Land Classification Commission.

"3860.30. The property finally classified as waste land continues to be subject to rental and shall be administered by the classifying agency or such agency as it may designate. When, in the judgment of the Land Classification Commission, this waste land is rehabilitated, it shall be reclassified as to private or public use in the same manner as tax-deeded property being classified for the first time.

"3860.31. At any time, all State and local agencies shall supply all information requested by the classifying agency or the Land Classification Commission.

"3860.32. Any money necessary for carrying out the provisions of this chapter shall be appropriated only out of the tax deeded land rental fund. This section is not an appropriation, but only prescribes the fund out of which appropriations are to be made by other provisions of law for the purposes of this chapter."

SEC. 25. Chapter IXc, consisting of sections 3861.1 to 3861.8, inclusive, is hereby added to Title IX of Part III of the Political Code, to read as follows:

"CHAPTER IXC. TERMINATING RIGHT OF REDEMPTION

"3861.1. The right of redemption of property which was deeded to the State before the effective date of section 3785.4 shall be terminated under this chapter.

"3861.2. Within one year after the effective date of this chapter, or within six months after default under any plan for payment of delinquent taxes in installments, whichever is later, the tax collector shall send a notice of termination of right of redemption by registered mail to the last assessee of every assessment of tax deeded property which was deeded to the State before the effective date of section 3785.4. The notice need not be mailed if the last assessee files with the tax collector a waiver of the notice.

"3861.3. The notice of termination of right of redemption shall state:

"(a) The time of termination of the right of redemption;

"(b) A description of the property;

"(c) That if the property is not redeemed, or payment of delinquent taxes in installments is not started, before the time set for termination of the right of redemption, the right of redemption will cease.

"3861.4. The tax collector may also publish the notice of termination of right of redemption once in a newspaper published in the county, or, if none, by posting in three conspicuous places in the county.

"3861.5. The time set for the termination of the right of redemption shall be four months after the notice of termination of the right of redemption is sent.

"3861.6. If any property is not redeemed, or payment of delinquent taxes in installments is not started, before the time set for termination of the right of redemption, the right of redemption as to such property is terminated.

"3861.7. Failure of the tax collector to send the notice of termination of the right of redemption within the time limited in this chapter does not affect the validity of the termination of the right of redemption within the proper time after the notice is actually sent. The tax collector shall be liable for any damages suffered by the county or State because of his failure to send the notice within the time limited in this chapter.

"3861.8. When the right of redemption of any property is terminated under this chapter, and the property is classified for public use, the minimum price which the administering agency shall pay to the county is the cost of mailing and publishing the notice of termination of right of redemption."

SEC. 26. Section 3857.2 of the Political Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3857.2. 'Redemptioner' means any person entitled to redeem real property from tax sale or who would be so entitled if the right of redemption were not terminated."

Sec. 27. Section 3859.18 of the Political Code is hereby repealed.

Sec. 28. Section 3859.20 of the Political Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3859.20. This invalidity redemption shall be made within one year after the interlocutory decree establishing the invalidity becomes a final judgement."

Sec. 29. Section 3773.1 of the Political Code is hereby repealed.

Sec. 30. Section 3773.1 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"3773.1. The Legislature hereby declares that it is the policy of this State to use any revenues received by the State from the administration of property which has been sold or deeded to the State for taxes for the primary purpose of restoring such tax deeded property to the assessment rolls and for all other purposes incident to the administration and classification of property which has been sold or deeded to the State for taxes and such revenues are hereby appropriated for the purposes specified in this section. No money shall be appropriated from the tax deeded land rental fund except for the purposes specified in this section. Any unencumbered balance in excess of $5,000 remaining in the tax deeded land rental fund on June 30th of each fiscal year shall be transferred to the general fund."

Sec. 31. Section 3773.2 is hereby added to the Political Code, to read as follows:

"3773.2. An advisory committee on tax deeded property is hereby ccreated. The committee shall consist of six members, appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Controller, and holding office at the pleasure of the Governor. Three members of this committee shall represent the interests of the counties of this State and three members shall represent the interest of the cities of this State. The members of this committee shall serve without compensation, except that they shall each receive from the tax deeded land rental fund the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the course of their duties.

"The advisory committee on tax deeded property shall meet on call of the Controller for the purpose of conference and making recommendations in regard to:

"(a) Restoring tax deeded property to the rolls;

"(b) All other purposes relating to the administration of tax sold property and tax deeded property."

Sec. 32. Until the right of redemption of property heretofore deeded to the State is terminated in accordance with this act, none of the provisions of this act shall affect the right to redeem such property or to commence or to continue payment of delinquent taxes in installments in accordance with the provisions of law in effect on the effective date of this act.

Sec. 33. The provisions of this act making amendments to the Revenue and Taxation Code take effect at the same time the Revenue and Taxation Code takes effect, at which time any section of the Political Code amended or added by this act is hereby repealed.

Senate Bill No. 81

CHAPTER 12

An act making an appropriation for the relief of hardship and destitution due to and caused by unemployment, providing the conditions and terms upon which any expenditure for such relief may be made and declaring that this act shall take effect immediately

[Became a law on the twenty-fourth day of February 1940 under constitutional provision, Article IV, section 16, having passed both houses by he constitutional majority, upon reconsideration, after its return by the Governor without his approval.]

[Filed with Secretary of State February 24, 1940]

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. In addition to any other funds provided by law, the sum of twelve million, two hundred thousand dollars ($12,200,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the State treasury, not otherwise appropriated, for the relief of hardship and destitution due to and caused by unemployment, and the administration thereof, until June 1, 1940, as provided by the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935 including not to exceed two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) for the administrative expenses of the State Controller in connection therewith.

This appropriation in its entirety is exempted from the provisions of the Relief Expenditure Act of 1940.

SEC. 2. The sum appropriated by this act, except the money available for the administrative expenses of the Controller, shall, upon order of the State Controller, be transferred to the unemployment-relief fund and shall be disbursed therefrom for the purposes herein provided. Until such time as such transfer is made, or when there is no money in said fund, the procedure for transfer of money from other funds prescribed by section 1a of the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935 shall be applicable hereto.

SEC. 3. The money appropriated by this act, except the money available for the administrative expenses of the Controller, shall be available for all the expenditures authorized in accordance with the amounts provided in the following schedule:

(a) For February and March 1940, not more than $5,500,000.

(b) For April 1940, not more than $3,500,000.

(c) For May 1940, not more than $3,000,000.

If any reduction of relief allowances is necessary in order to abide by the apportionments provided in this section for the expenditure of the appropriation, such reduction shall be effected by reducing the amount of the allowance for each relief case in lieu of dropping from the rolls relief cases otherwise eligible for relief under this act.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of expending the amounts provided in this act, every person, who, on the effective date of this act, was eligible for relief under the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935 and the rules and regulations of the Relief Commission established in pursuance thereof, shall be entitled to relief from the appropriation provided in this act if his eligibility continues thereunder, notwithstanding any action of the Relief Administrator or the Relief Commission subsequent to the effective date of this act.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Relief Commission is hereby authorized, for the purposes of administering this appropriation and safeguarding its expenditure, to establish and enforce immediately rules of eligibility for relief from the appropriation consistent with the provisions of this act relating to eligibility for relief from the appropriation after April 1, 1940.

SEC. 5. (a) On and after April 1, 1940, not less than 82 percent of the money appropriated by this act shall consist, when expended, of payments in cash, wages, personal property, and services directly to persons eligible for relief, and not more than 3 percent, in addition to money otherwise available, may be used, when expended, for works projects directly sponsored by the Relief Administrator, independent of and not in cooperation with the Work Projects Administration. If any sponsorship contribution is made to the Work Projects Administration by the Relief Administrator, the contribution may be charged, when expended, to to the 82-percent classification provided in this section. All expenditures made for (i) distribution of surplus commodities, (ii) the maintenance and operation of relief camps under subdivisions (c) and (d) of section 3 of the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935, and (iii) the maintenance and operation of medical and dental clinics, may be charged, when expended, to the 82-percent classification provided in this section.

(b) Of the sum appropriated by this act, any amounts expended by the Relief Administrator in accordance with the provisions of subdivisions (a) and (f), or either, of section 3 of the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935 for work relief projects sponsored by the Federal Government and by any political subdivision, district, or municipality of the State either alone or in conjunction with the Relief Administrator, shall be exempt from section 669 of the Political Code and the limitations, if any, of the Budget Act of 1939.

(c) From the effective date of this act, of the amount which may be expended for work projects directly sponsored by the Relief Administrator, independent of and not in cooperation with the Work Projects Administration, not more than one-third (⅓) thereof, as if the 3 percent limitation of subdivision (a) were in effect, shall be expended for self-help cooperatives, for production for use projects, or for other forms of production cooperatives, consumer cooperatives, or direct production projects. No such cooperative or project shall produce, manufacture, process or sell consumable goods for consumption or use by any person, firm, association or corporation, other than a person directly participating in the work of such cooperative or project and other than a relief client.

(d) The money available under the provisions of this section for work projects may be used for the administrative expenses incurred in connection therewith.

(e) If any money is not expended in the month for which it is available under the provisions of section 3, the unexpended amount may be expended in any subsequent month without regard to the apportionment provided for that subsequent month.

Sec. 6. Of the governmental agencies through which section 3 of the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935 authorized the Relief Administrator to make expenditures, the counties as such governmental agencies under the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935 shall, for the purposes of examination, have access at all reasonable times to all records of the Relief Administrator and the Relief Commission.

Sec. 6.5. In order to safeguard the money for the purposes for which it is appropriated, the Relief Administrator and the Relief Commission may contract with one or more credit associations, credit organizations, or financial investigating agencies to ascertain the financial condition and credit rating of applicants for, and recipients of, relief from the money appropriated by this act.

Sec. 7. On and after April 1, 1940, the appropriation made by section 1 of this act shall be expended to and for the relief of all persons who are not totally incapacitated for gainful employment and to and for the relief of all dependents of such persons provided such persons and their dependents are, as to need, otherwise eligible for relief under rules and regulations established by the Relief Commission under section 8 of the California Unemployment Relief Act of 1935; provided, however, that none of said appropriation shall be expended to, or used for the relief of, persons who on February 18, 1940, were receiving aid from any of the several counties as indigents.

Sec. 8. The total relief allowance, whether in cash or kind, from the appropriation made by this act shall not be more than fifty-eight dollars per month per family. In determining the total relief allowance, the cash income from employment, from the Work Projects Administration or from any other source, of any member of the family who is receiving relief from this appropriation shall be deducted from the total allowance the family is permitted to receive from the appropriation made by this act. Relief, in addition to the maximum of fifty-eight dollars per month allowance, may, however, be granted, but (i) only in the form of commodities, services, or other forms of relief in kind and (ii) only in extraordinary cases, which term "extraordinary cases" shall include within its scope families of extraordinary size.

Any surplus commodities distributed by the Federal Government or any agency thereof shall not be deducted in determining the maximum relief allowance of any family.

The restrictions contained in this section apply to all expenditures for relief made from this appropriation on and after April 1, 1940.

Sec. 9. (a) None of the appropriation made by this act shall be expended, on and after April 1, 1940, for the relief of any person who:

(1) Has not resided continuously in this State for a period of at least three years with intent to make it his home, or

(2) Has lost his residence by remaining away from this State for an uninterrupted period of one year.

Within the meaning of this subdivision (a), time spent in a public institution or on parole therefrom is to be disregarded in determining the period of residence in this State. Absence from the State for labor or other special or temporary purposes does not occasion loss of residence.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (a), the appropriation made by this act may be expended for the relief of any person who:

(1) On February 1, 1940 (i) is receiving or has received relief from the Relief Administrator and Relief Commission or (ii) is certified or has been certified to the Work Projects Administration or its predecessor by the Relief Administrator and the Relief Commission, and

(2) Has not left the State with intent to reside elsewhere, and

(3) Has not remained away from the State for a period of one year.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (a), the appropriation shall be available for the costs of transportation of a nonresident to any State in which he resides. Every nonresident, who has once received relief under this subdivision (c), shall not again be granted relief from the appropriation made by this act.

Sec. 10. On and after April 1, 1940, none of the appropriation shall be expended for the relief of any alien who entered the United States illegally subsequent to July 1, 1924. In order to be eligible for relief from the appropriation, every alien, unless he first proves entry prior to July 1, 1924, shall prove his entry into the United States was legal.

If relief from the appropriation is barred to any alien by the terms of this section, the members of his family shall not be affected thereby and the family, exclusive of the alien, shall remain entitled to relief from the appropriation made by this act notwithstanding this section and shall receive the same relief it would have received if the alien were not a member thereof.

The presence of all alien applicants for relief from this appropriation shall be reported immediately to the United States immigration authorities.

Sec. 11. To secure relief from the appropriation made by this act, an applicant, on and after April 1, 1940, for such relief shall prove, to the satisfaction of the State Relief Administration, his eligibility therefor, including his eligibility as to need, residence and citizenship.

All statements made by an applicant for such relief shall be verified by the oath of the applicant, on and after April 1, 1940. Every employee of the Relief Administrator receiving an application for such relief in the course of his official duties may administer an oath to the applicant for such relief.

If the applicant for such relief wilfully makes any false statement in his application for such relief from the appropriation made by this act, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sec. 12. None of the appropriation made by this act shall be expended for the relief of any person who is, or any member of whose family is, making payments upon any chattel mortgage or conditional sales contract for personal property, other than payments for essential food and essential clothing, in excess of five dollars per month, when the debt, secured by the chattel mortgage or conditional sales contract, was incurred subsequent to his application for relief from the appropriation made by this act.

Sec. 12.3. If any county takes any recipients of relief resident of that county from the State Relief Administration, furnishes all materials, equipment, tools, supervision, and transportation, and sponsors and finances useful but nonessential work relief projects, it may, but need not, reimburse the State for the value of the labor supplied by the Relief Administration.

Sec. 12.5. All money received by any relief client from this appropriation for himself or his dependents shall be used exclusively for food, rent, utilities and any other necessities. The Relief Commission shall establish rules and regulations, in accordance with this section, relating to the purposes for which relief clients may not expend money received by them from this appropriation.

Any relief client who uses the money received by him for purposes other than those permitted by this section and such rules and regulations may be disqualified for any further relief from this appropriation.

Sec. 13. In determining the amount to be expended from the appropriation for the relief of any person and his family consideration shall be given (i) to the amounts of public assistance, if any, such person and his family are receiving under any other provision of law and (ii) to the standards of living, wage rates, and living conditions in the locality in which such person and his family reside.

Sec. 14. On and after April 1, 1940, none of the appropriation made by this act may be expended for the relief of any person who possesses, or whose family possesses, more than one automobile, unless such person or persons shall deliver the license plates of all but one of the automobiles to the State Relief Administration.

Sec. 15. (a) It is unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any compensation, employment, relief or other benefit provided for or made possible in whole or in part by the appropriation, to any individual as consideration, favor or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

(b) It is unlawful for any person to deprive, attempt to deprive or threaten to deprive by any means any person of any relief or other public assistance provided for or made possible in whole or in part by the appropriation on account of any political activity, support of or opposition to any candidate or to any political party in any election.

(c) It is unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit or receive, or be in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription or contribution of money for any political purpose whatever from any person receiving compensation, employment, relief or other benefit made available from the appropriation.

(d) It is unlawful for any person to furnish or disclose or to aid or assist in furnishing or disclosing any names of persons receiving compensation, employment, relief or other benefits provided or made possible by the appropriation to any political candidate, committee, campaign manager or to any person for delivery to a political candidate, committee or campaign manager, and it is unlawful for any person to receive any such names for political purposes.

(e) No part of the appropriation shall be used for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing or attempting to influence or interfering with or restraining or coercing any person in the exercise of his right to vote at any election.

(f) It is unlawful for any person employed in any capacity in connection with the administration or disbursement of the appropriation to take an active part in political management, or be an active member of political organizations or take an active part in political campaigns which have as their purpose the election or nomination of any person to any office or employment, or to be a candidate for nomination or election to any office, whether partisan or nonpartisan.

(g) It is unlawful for any preson employed in any capacity in connection with the administration or disbursement of the appropriation to influence or attempt to influence any individual known to be receiving compensation, employment, relief or other benefits provided by the appropriation to support or oppose any candidate or any political party in any election.

(h) Every person violating any provision of this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and in addition to the penalty imposed therefor shall not be entitled to any further compensation or employment provided for or made possible in whole or in part by the appropriation.

(i) As used in this section "appropriation" refers to the sum appropriated in section 1 of this act.

Sec. 16. The Legislature hereby declares that the use of the money appropriated by this act for the support of a publicity department and the making of expenditures for press releases, publicity statements, propaganda and other forms of appeals to the public is contrary to its policy in providing this appropriation for the relief of hardship and destitution due to and caused by unemployment.

Sec. 16.5. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this act is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act. The Legislature hereby declares that it would have passed this act, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional.

Sec. 17. This act is hereby declared to be an urgency measure, necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety within the meaning of section 1 of Article IV of the Constitution and as such shall take effect immediately. The facts constituting such necessity are as follows:

The appropriation for unemployment relief for the ninety-first fiscal year is inadequate and is about to be exhausted and it is necessary that additional funds be made available immediately. Unless this act providing immediate funds and the means for the expenditure thereof and safeguards against their waste takes effect immediately relief operations will have to be suspended at a time when the need is great, which will result in untold hardship and suffering to a great number of persons receiving relief in this State at this time, and will cause serious unrest throughout the State.

Mr. Abbott. I offer a file offered by Dr. Lee A. Stone, health officer, Madera County, Calif.

(The file referred to was received and marked as an exhibit. The following article is from this file. The balance of the material is held in committee files.

THE MIGRANT SITUATION IN MADERA COUNTY, CALIF.

By Lee Alexander Stone, M. D., F. A. P. H. A. Health Officer

INTRODUCTION

I am indebted to Mr. Neils Overgaard, agricultural commissioner, for his assistance in preparing material under the heading "Economic data." To him, I express my appreciation.

Mr. Howard Rowe, county superintendent of schools, gave me of his time that I might speak with authority on "Education." Mr. Rowe yields to no man when it comes to serving the school population of Madera County. The school system in the county has made many improvements since he took office a few years ago. Teachers in the county make no distinction between migrant children and others. Educational standards have remained the same for both.

Mr. Harrison M. Scott, director of the welfare department of Madera County, has prepared for our use a statement worth while your careful perusal. His statement is included in this report.

Mr. Scott is classed as being one of the best qualified welfare directors in the State of California. His work has been outstanding and has been followed and copied in part or wholly by nearly every county welfare organization in the State. His advice has been sought by two governors and by many groups both official and otherwise in State and county governments. His careful management of county, State, and Federal funds has made for him a most enviable reputation in his field. He is not a professional trained social worker. He has come up from the ranks. In 1928, he was a Madera County farmer possessed of more than usual administrative ability and common sense and because of this he was named welfare director by the board of supervisors in 1929. He knows his work from every angle and never is too busy to take on a new job. Time and effort have meant nothing to him. His sole desire is to serve as best he can the people of Madera County and of California. He is called at all hours of the day and night and never have I known him to be too weary or too socially conscious to allow anything to interfere with what he conceived to be his duty. When I asked his aid to make this report complete, he gave it most willingly.

* * * * * * *

Perhaps I should not attempt to answer all of the questions presented in the questionnaire on the migrant situation in Madera County as submitted to me by the San Joaquin Valley agricultural section of the State Chamber of Commerce (questionnaire attached). I am answering them because as the county health officer of Madera County, I have had much to do with housing, education, economic data, health and welfare. My office has been for years more or less a place of rendevoux where ideas on all phases of public welfare have been discussed by individuals seeking a solution for their difficulties. It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve agriculture in California for the past 10 years. During that time I have studied many of the problems farmers must face; I have tried in my humble way to assist in their solution. Housing, sanitation, and public health have been but a part of my work. I have believed it my duty, if I was to make a success of public-health work, to study the problems of those with whom I was in constant association. If I have rendered even small assistance, I am happy.

Housing.—In 1932, I approached the growers of the county and asked their support in a grower owned camp project which would place labor camps on agricultural acreages owned by farmers. That I met with success and a fine cooperative spirit is attested to by the fact that in Madera County there are 130 labor camps with a cabin population approximating 3,000 cabins—all are grower owned.

There are no Federal Government camps in the county. For years I have fought the establishment or building of such camps anywhere in the State of California. At many meetings of the State chamber of commerce, and one in particular, held in Los Angeles, I have spoken against such camps with the result Mr. Roy Pike and I, at the Los Angeles meeting in 1935, were appointed as a resolutions committee to protest their erection anywhere in the State. I am still opposed to any type of paternalism which lowers the morale of people who, if left alone, might work out their own destiny. I do not believe that it is the duty of either the Federal Government or the State to keep alive professional indigency. There are thousands upon thousands of people in California and elsewhere who have lost all moral and physical stamina and have dropped to such a low level as now to be professional beggars. These persons have grown accustomed to accepting a living at the hands of the government, State, or county. They have lost all of their self-respect. Their morale is completely broken down. To prove this statement correct all one has to do is to visit any welfare department in California on certain days and watch the long lines of human beings waiting to receive what many with their indolent brains consider their just due.

The Farm Security Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture has spent millions of dollars to erect camps to house free (the small payments indigents pay to live in these camps is mere subterfuge), people that they may pay homage to the founders of the New Deal. These people were in the main once self-respecting and humble. Their needs were small and they were proud to work that money might be earned to pay their meager expenses.

I believe that if growers had been loaned the millions spent by the Farm Security Administration with which to construct places to properly house labor, on long time terms with low interest rates, a professional indigent class would not now be as numerous as they are. Growers, or farmers as you may choose to call them, are going broke each year because of increase in taxation made necessary to keep alive an obnoxious paternal system which if carried on for a few years longer, will bankrupt the Nation and the State of California, and bring communism with its cruelties to our own doors.

There are no county camps in Madera County—its farmers are capable of and are willing to house the labor they employ in livable cabins. These cabins may not appeal to the sensitive minds of esthetes. They do keep camp inhabitants protected from the elements, and if the tenant is of the right sort, each cabin becomes a proper home. In the main, labor camps offer better places of habitation than their occupants had ever occupied in their lives before. In many instances because of grower liberality, migrants are allowed to remain in camps the year around. They pay no rent, and yet a great number befoul the cabins in which they live to an extent that no self-respecting hog would occupy one with them.

There have been no squatter camps in Madera County since January 1932. The reason for this being that the health department of the county which I represent sees to it that those who might become squatters are kept on the move. Every time a group of squatters or a single squatter is located, either the health officer or his sanitary inspector orders them to move on. In keeping squatters on the move, I have had the fine cooperation of the sheriff's office, the highway patrol, and the local police in the cities of the county. Madera County boasts a squatters ordinance passed in 1939.

There was no deficiency of housing in labor camps in Madera County in 1940, nor has there been a deficiency in the last 8 years at any time during the peak harvest periods.

There is definitely no shortage of housing for migrants in labor camps in the county. There is a definite deficiency in the cities of the county of houses for those able to pay a small rental charge. Hundreds of migrants who have attained a year's residence are having their rent paid by State relief administration and if for a shorter period money grants are supplied by the Farm Security Administration.

Unquestionably farmers in my county would welcome long time low interest loans for constructing housing for farm workers. As I have pointed out already if some of the millions that have been spent on Federal Government camps had been loaned growers the money eventually would be paid back and not lost as it is now with no hope of repayment.

Madera County never has been interested in community camps for the reason that growers do not believe them practical.

Education.—The school population of Madera County has increased by leaps and bounds in recent years. Every school in Madera, Chowchilla, and in all sections west and northwest of Madera has been hard put to properly care for the increased load of attendance that has been put upon them by migrants. Elementary and high schools have been compelled to add new buildings or extra rooms to their schools to take care of the increased load.

School facilities are now adequate to handle all migrant children, with the exception of the city of Chowchilla which needs for the present load eight additional schoolrooms. A recently passed school bond issue of $70,000 will take care of this bad situation.

Overcrowding at first did affect in many places in the county the efficiency of teaching. Today this has been overcome by new additions to present school buildings.

Madera County has seven migratory schools employing 11 teachers. In all instances these schools are of modern construction.

There never has been any discrimination against migrant children. All attendants in the schools of the county are treated alike. No favoritism is ever shown one pupil over another.

No discrimination against migrant adults ever has been shown.

The honorable hardworking migrant receives respect at the hands of every good citizen of the county.

Economic data.—According to tax statements there were 3,225 farms in Madera County in 1920—4,516 in 1930, and 4,695 in 1935, according to tax bills mailed by the tax collector. This statement may not be altogether correct for the reason that tax bills may represent separate holdings of individual farmers located in different sections of the county. A new mailing list I have had prepared in the office of the health unit shows 1,650 names of farmers for 1940. This list is reasonably accurate and gives the names of all growers regardless of crops in the county. It does not, however, give the names of tenant farmers who hold leases for acreage belonging to another and in whose name the tax bill appears.

The average acreage in Madera County has decreased considerably since 1920 and also since 1930. Madera County farmers on the average do not own large acreages. Since 1935 much farming territory has been opened up west of the city of Madera. This statement also holds true of much of the region west of Chowchilla.

There are always opportunities open for live, wideawake, willing-to-work migrants to become both farm tenants and farm owners in Madera County. There are many who have come from the Dust Bowl during the past few years who have taken advantage of opportunities to become farm tenants and farm owners. These people are good farmers and hold the respect of old timers. All of them have started out in a small way, been thrifty and obtained new land as fast as their finances would permit. Madera County offers every opportunity to progressive men and women willing to spend of their brawn and brains that success may come to them. No farmer can make a success unless he puts into his farm the work necessary to keep it going.

It stands to reason that Madera County during the next few years, because of the many improvements going on in the county, will need more farm workers than it has in the past. Requirements for labor on the farm rarely remain at a standstill. As agricultural enterprises develop the greater is the need for farm labor. The day must come when agricultural labor will be employed on the basis of their ability to produce in exactly the same way as big business demands of labor in their employ, whether as clerks, bookkeepers, salesmen, etc.; if employees cannot aid those by whom they are employed to make money with which to operate and show a profit, they are eliminated and others are hired to take their places. Agriculture is one of the most important businesses in the world today and must take its place alongside of public utility corporations, steel mills, the automotive industry and many others too numerous to mention here.

* * * * * * *

Attached will be found the 1939 report of "Acreage, production and value of agricultural products" for Madera County as compiled by Neils Overgaard, county agricultural commissioner. This report I hope will prove illuminating to the committee.

Public health.—For 10 years I have fought the battle of public health in Madera County. For 10 years I have been compelled to listen to complaints that the county was spending too much money for the protection of the health of its people, and especially its children. The 1939–40 budget of the Madera County health unit was $5,280 appropriated from county funds. Out of this amount must come the salary of the health officer, the salary of the secretary, gasoline, oil, and repairs of the county-owned car, plus office supplies, vaccines and other immunizing material. If I need extras or some necessities, I beg them from Government or State agencies and sometimes from generous growers.

In 1930 Madera County's population was 17,164; during the depression the population dropped to around 14,000 persons. From 1934 until December 31, 1940, approximately 18,000 new people have moved in, 98 percent of whom came from the Dust Bowl States, southern Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. The population of the county has more than doubled in 5 years. During those 5 years the work of the health department has increased fiftyfold, and yet in that time there has been no increase in money for its use.

Ten years is a long time if one has had to battle almost alone during that period to prove that health protection is to be desired over pestilences and epidemics.

Probably the most trying years for those in public health in California have occurred since the migration of Dust Bowl refugees began in 1934. These people brought little with them in the way of contagious or infectious diseases What they did bring was no immunity, thus when an outbreak of a contagious disease occurred they immediately caught it and in many instances it went through their ranks like a scourge. For example between January 1 and August 30, 1939, 74,549 cases of measles occurred over the State of California. No such number had ever occurred before; migrants were the greatest sufferers. To recount only a few of the major outbreaks since 1930, I quote from the records of the California State Department of Public Health:

Disease	Year	Cases
Diphtheria	1930	3,071
	1935	2,112
	1938	1,615
	1939 [1]	917
Malaria	1930	94
	1935	173
	1938	258
	1939 [1]	169
Measles	1927	58,963
	1930	46,968
	1936	53,838
	1938	24,558
	1939 [1]	74,549
Poliomyelitis	1927	1,298
	1930	1,9 3
	1934	3,396
Poliomyelitis—Continued	1938	117
	1939 [1]	553
Smallpox	1930	3,139
	1935	309
	1938	1,266
	1939 [1]	651
Tuberculosis (pulmonary and other active forms)	1930	11,293
	1935	8,238
	1938	7,662
	1939 [1]	5,439
Typhoid	1930	743
	1935	534
	1938	473
	1939 [1]	196

[1] To Sept. 1, 1939.

In November 1937 a health officer in a county in the lower San Joaquin Valley visited a labor camp on the supposition that there was some scarlet fever in the camp; instead he found smallpox; he announced that he would return in the morning and vaccinate. During the night 50 families left under the cover of darkness. They were afraid of vaccination, a fear born of superstition. These 50 families presented California with 1,917 cases of smallpox between the months of January 1938 and August 30, 1939. In other words they apparently never had been vaccinated—vaccination actually protects, thus they caught smallpox and spread it to others.

Miss H. Eva Barnes, county health nurse, reported to me on January 28, 1938, at 4:30 p. m. that she had discovered smallpox in a labor camp on the San Joaquin River near Firebaugh in Madera County. I found 27 cases in this camp the following morning.

My department went into immediate action and between 11 a. m. on January 29 to May 1st, 1938, we vaccinated 9,000 persons. The immunity of those vaccinated was so low that we got 98½ percent "takes." One does not have to have a very vivid imagination to understand the potentialities an outbreak among unvaccinated or nonimmune groups entails. Had my department not gone into action at once the chances are that a serious epidemic would undoubtedly have occurred. At the time a person was vaccinated a dressing was applied. In 7 days that person was seen again to discover whether or not his vaccination was successful. If not, he was revaccinated. A new dressing was placed on every arm seen. In other words instead of seeing a vaccinated person once he or she was seen twice, thus doubling our efforts to prevent a serious outbreak. Nine thousand people had their arms dressed twice at an interval of 7 days; 18,000 dressings were done. My entire staff worked every day including Sundays and for 3 months either in rain or in the mud.

Dr. Walter M. Dickie, then director of the State department of public health, generously furnished me with a doctor and an extra nurse to assist my nurse and me. He also gave me vaccine necessary to use in the immunization campaign. The cost to the county of Madera for material in the way of cotton dressings and acetone did not exceed $300. Forty-four cases of smallpox occurred between January 28 and May 1938 in Madera County. Those with the disease never had been vaccinated previously and with no exception all of them had come from the Dust Bowl. In order to protect citizens from infection, a guard was employed at the camp where 27 cases of smallpox occurred. No one was allowed to leave the camp, therefore the entire camp had to be fed by the welfare department at a cost in excess of $5,000.

On March 5 at 2:30 a. m. 1938—near Firebaugh in Madera County 11 places in the levee were broken through by the San Joaquin River which was at flood stage. These breaks completely flooded the Miller Hotchkiss, the Paup, the Burkhart Camp. The welfare director of Madera County notified me at once, and he with 3 others, among whom was a Red Cross representative, headed for Firebaugh. On our arrival we found about 800 people crowded around the city hall, many without anything except the extreme necessities in clothing. All flood refugees with the possible exception of 50 had not lived in California 1 year. They had come from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, and Texas. They were given their breakfast and some clothing.

I telephoned Mr. Jonathan Garst then head of the Farm Security Administration with offices in San Francisco and asked his assistance after stating our problem. He telephoned Washington and afterward called me back at Firebaugh in less than an hour. The Farm Security Administration at that time turned over $10,000 emergency money to Madera County, for the care of refugees.

In the county just outside the city limits of the city of Madera was an abandoned schoolhouse located on about 5 acres of ground. Every flood refugee was brought to this school building and its surrounding acreage. The flood occurred on Saturday, March 5. The refugees arrived on the school grounds at about 3:30 p. m. Our party arrived at 4 p. m. The fight to give them proper care in the way of housing, food, and clothing began. A complete kitchen was set up in the schoolhouse; one large classroom was used that women and children might be fed; later cots, mattresses, and blankets furnished by the Red Cross were moved in and the women and children were bedded down for the night. The other schoolroom was used as a temporary hospital. Extra water toilets were installed by a local plumber, as well as a gas floor furnace for each large schoolroom, plus a gas circulating water heater for dishwashing and bathing.

I ordered 55,000 feet of lumber 1 by 12 by 16 and 2 by 4 by 16 for tent floors. Electricians were put to work installing a lighting system along tent streets and elsewhere over the camp, which on completion looked like an army camp. Every person in the camp was fed by the Red Cross with the assistance of the director of the county welfare department, Mr. H. M. Scott. Eighty tent platforms were constructed between 5:30 and 8:30 p. m., with the aid of the refugees themselves, the American Legion, and Work Projects Administration. At 11:30 p. m. tents were received from the Presidio at San Francisco and furnished by the Red Cross. Before 2 a. m., 80 tents were set up and cots, mattresses, and blankets were placed in them. By 2:30 every male refugee plus a few women were bedded down for the night. There was other work to do, therefore a few of us including Mr. Scott and I remained until about 4 a. m.

At 7 a. m., Sunday, March 6, we were back on the job. All refugees were fed cafeteria style by the Red Cross. I directed the sanitary inspector of the health unit to remain on the camp grounds at all times to see that proper sanitary rules were observed. I also ordered 12 Work Projects Administration privies, and directed the further construction of tent platforms necessary for the needs of the camp. During the afternoon over 600 persons were given a first dose of typhoid vaccine. The setting up of an emergency hospital under control of Red Cross nurses was completed.

On Monday, March 7, the 12 Work Projects Administration privies ordered on Sunday, plus 2 bathhouses containing 6 showers each with a gas automatic heater to insure hot water were installed. A delousing station was also put into the camp. A real necessity, I assure you.

The entire camp was completely set up and in perfect operation in about 48 hours.

The refugee camp lasted 30 days. Every person occupying it lived well. Clothing, tobacco, and candy were plentiful. Many persons from the East Bay region donated handsomely of the above articles. Everything possible for the comfort of the refugees was done, plus installation of play equipment for children and adults alike.

Not a single contagious disease occurred in the camp during the entire 30 days of its existence. Sanitation was as nearly perfect as good inspection and equipment could make it.

I have purposely gone into detail on the subjects of smallpox and smallpox vaccination and the flood refugee camp for the reason I have wanted to lay before you facts to prove that migrants have not been badly treated by Madera County. They have received every attention, when the need has arisen for it, at the hands of authorities and also from the people of the county.

On January 11, 1940, an immunizing campaign for the prevention of diphtheria was started in the county schools. Over 3,800 immunizations were done to February 2, 1940, with more to come. The campaign ends early in February 1940.

Since April 1931 more than 8,000 children have been protected. Sixty percent of the immunizing for diphtheria done in January 1940 was in children of migrants. Immunizations are done free to all.

I call your attention to a listing of the record of contagious diseases, by year, since 1931. This list tells a very definite story. It shows that instead of contagious disease rates decreasing as they should have under normal conditions, they have either remained about equal from year to year or have risen to higher incidence. This is because at no time since 1934 has there been a let-up on the increasing number of migrants who have arrived in the county over a 6-year period. I have already pointed out that the majority of these people have little or no immunity to contagious or infectious diseases.

Thousands of migrants are constantly on the move, hence they may contract a disease in one county and before the period of incubation is over, may be hundreds of miles away from the original contact before they are taken ill.

Public-health officials are hard put in their attempts to control contagious and bad sanitary practices.

Good sanitation is rarely observed by the average migrant for the good and simple reason his previous method of living had no place in it for either cleanliness or proper sanitary expression.

Health officers, public-health nurses, and sanitary inspectors can relate by the hour true tales of insanitary practices as indulged in by migrants only to have them doubted by esthetes. If the average doubter would take time off and spend a few days with any health officer or sanitary inspector located in the San Joaquin Valley, I feel sure he would no longer disbelieve the words of expert men and women who spend most of their working days among refugees from the Dust Bowl.

The Madera County health unit, even with its limited budget, is doing as much good public-health work, and in many instances more, than any county in California.

Communicable diseases reported

Disease	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Chicken pox	41	74	102	168	136	67	128	178	356
Diphtheria	15	14	3	2	6	6	12	2	24
Dysentery	------	1	------	------	2	2	7	9	1
Encephalitis:									
Poliom	------	------	------	------	------	------	3	------	------
Epidemic	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	7
Influenza	1	7	------	------	------	450	2,675	446	51
Malaria	------	------	------	------	------	2	1	4	1
Measles	198	335	2	42	284	295	12	602	205
German	------	1	2	22	17	17	1	------	------
Meningitis, epidemic	1	2	------	------	------	1	4	1	------
Mumps	104	158	12	20	7	20	216	843	187
Pneumonia (all forms)	9	10	2	7	12	15	111	33	20
Poliomyelitis	------	2	------	8	3	3	1	------	9
Rabies, animal	31	2	------	------	43	14	2	1	16
Scarlet fever	9	16	20	24	25	51	79	59	46
Smallpox	------	14	------	------	------	1	------	44	------
Tetanus	------	------	------	------	1	------	1	1	1
Typhoid fever	13	19	6	10	5	14	4	3	------
Trachoma	------	1	------	------	------	35	4	6	3
Tuberculosis	26	29	17	15	21	30	65	52	45
Whooping cough	60	8	102	224	7	26	197	197	2
Cerebrospinal meningitis	------	------	1	------	------	------	------	------	------
Cocc. granuloma	1	------	------	------	------	------	1	2	1
Erysipelas	1	1	2	1	2	4	2	2	1
Food poisoning	7	1	7	------	53	15	23	------	20
Gonorrhea	2	8	13	10	9	22	69	41	49
Leprosy	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------	------
Pellagra	1	------	------	------	------	------	6	1	------
Syphilis	3	6	------	1	------	8	76	68	67
Acute lethargic encephalitis	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1
Jaundice	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	------

In our public health work we are proud to say that whenever information on birth control is sought by migrants we give it gladly; also we supply birth-control materials free. These materials cost the county nothing. Migrants are noted for their fertility as may be attested by any county hospital in the San Joaquin Valley. I believe if birth-control methods were carefully explained to migrant women, many would use them.

The above statement may excite some to protest. Maybe the statement I am about to make will bring condemnation from the sobby. I have not been interested for years in a rising birth rate. I would much prefer to see it drop to lower levels and know that the quality of the human race was being conserved. Quality not quantity in human beings is the crying need of a punch-drunk world, made so by its imbeciles.

The comparative report from the Bureau of Employment Security on migrants entering California from the Dust Bowl States makes interesting reading, particularly when yearly comparisons are made.

It will be startling I know to some who believe that the migrant wave has retarded to discover that since May 1939 there has been a steady increase in the number of migrants entering California as compared with the year 1938. Figures are not yet ready for December 1939.

This increase means but one thing: migrants are still writing home and begging their relatives and friends to come to California, the land where relief is easy to obtain.

Month	Grand total		Month	Grand total	
	1938	1939		1938	1939
January	7, 947	2, 390	August	3, 453	6, 212
February	7, 003	2, 530	September	3, 299	5, 049
March	6, 823	3, 269	October	3, 939	6, 104
April	5, 749	4, 281	November	4, 322	5, 774
May	5, 041	5, 095	December	(1)	(1)
June	3, 823	5, 446			
July	3, 166	5, 679	Total	54, 565	51, 829

[1] Incomplete.

There is no doubt in my mind after reading the masterly presentation made by Mr. Harrison S. Robinson before the La Follette committee on January 25, that he offers a means whereby a solution to the whole problem of the migratory may be reached. The State chamber of commerce is to be congratulated on his graphic and statesmanlike presentation.

Mr. Robinson heads the migrant committee of the State chamber. If his confreres on the migrant committee and the entire membership of the State chamber will work as hard as he has, and pledge themselves to use all of the influence in their power to find a means of solving California's most exciting and dangerous problem, a problem greater than any State ever has faced, I believe it will not be long before all of California's citizens will herald with paeans of praise the accomplishments of the California State Chamber of Commerce.

Unless the problems migrants have presented the State of California are solved, bankruptcy is ahead for many of its citizens. Tax burdens are already too heavy to be borne with comfort. Overtaxation has wrecked nations; it may wreck California. Overtaxation is the chief forerunner of revolution. Overtaxation ruined Russia; out of its ruins rose communism. Communism already is a world scourge—communism with its blighting breath and its sadistic cruelties leaves only destruction in its wake.

California's efforts to overcome the actions of those who seek to submerge the people of the State into the mire of subversive activity must be strong enough to bring about their entire defeat.

Ours is a golden State, golden in every sense of the word. Our people are possessed of a generous spirit, a desire to help those whom they think cannot help themselves; they are kind to the under dog and spend lavishly that his interests may be protected. They are idealists and dream of days to come when every person within the confines of California's borders may be freed from tortures of poverty or want. They have gone without themselves that the stranger at their gates might be served.

Let all of us as loyal Californians take stock of that sum which remains in the larders of those in charge of the spending of our tax money. Let all of us pledge ourselves to aid wisely those who are deserving of our help. Let all of us remember that charity begins at home and that unless we protect our loved ones that we are failing in our obligations to ourselves and to the great Commonwealth of California.

There is serious trouble ahead for all citizens of the State. Our watchword should be "Courage." Without courage we can get nowhere. Cowardice is the most loathsome word in our language.

GIRD YOUR LOINS, CALIFORNIANS

Pledge yourselves to battle, even though in the battle your own life might be the forfeit, to encompass subversive and revolutionary-minded creatures who are seeking to create chaos in our midst.

Carry with you everywhere you go the thought that California soil is worth while fighting for. Keep forever in your hearts and memories a prayer that California may always remain the Golden State of your dreams.

RELIEF AND MEDICAL CARE[1]

1 and 2. The State relief administration case load in Madera County is shown on the attached graph. The present case load is composed of 15 percent long-term residents and 85 percent persons who have aquired residence since 1935. From this last group, about 90 percent have a residence of less than 3 years.

It does, however, seem to be the tendency of the people who have arrived in the county of recent date to stay in the county, and not to follow the crops. This indicates that they expect to become permanent residents. In very few instances will any of these families consent to return to their place of legal residence.

The indigent case load in Madera County is shown on the following chart. All indigent cases are resident cases, as they are not eligible unless residence is first established.

SRA CASE LOAD, MADERA COUNTY 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940

(Lowest line represents 1937; 2nd line, 1938; 3rd line, 1939; 4th line, 1940)



Date	Cases	People	Date	Cases	People
Dec. 31, 1939	188	579	Dec. 31, 1937	76	243
June 30, 1939	169	549	January 1937		367
Dec. 31, 1938	170	540	July 1936	(?)	282
June 30, 1938	112	397			

Attached is the report from the welfare department of Madera County for the month of December 1939, for county indigent relief.

3. There has been no definite change or loosening up of the policy in this county in regard to the handling of an application for relief.

4. I would say that as far as the local administration is concerned, we have definitely established a policy that when private employment is available and known to this department, we have requested the client to take the private

---

[1] Compiled by H. M. Scott, welfare director.

employment. We have had very good cooperation from the employers in notifying us when the clients have been employed.

5. It is necessary for all applicants for relief to register with the California State Employment Service before relief can be granted. The California State Employment Service keeps the State relief administration informed at all times when jobs are available. We are very thankful that we have 100 percent cooperation from the employment service.

* * * * * * *

Following is a statement which we feel will show the general trend of relief not only from Madera County, but for the entire San Joaquin Valley. We feel that this is largely due to the influx of migrant labor from the Dust Bowl. These figures are somewhat startling and show the general trend of relief.

In 1929 the total relief load in this county including relief of every kind for the entire year was approximately $35,000. In December of 1939 relief from the various categorical aids; namely, State relief administration, Work Projects Administration, Federal Security Administration, National Youth Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, indigent aid, orphan aid, aged aid, blind aid, county hospital, and Ahwahnee amounted to $190,940.97 for 1 month.

This does not include administrative costs for State relief administration, Work Projects Administration, or Federal Security Administration. Neither does it include the sponsor's contributions to various work projects. Of course, the State and county derive a certain amount of benefit from these projects, which fact should be taken into account.

These figures are merely given to show the increased responsibility that is put on the taxpayers of the State so that people who are not legal residents of the State can be cared for.

Monthly average case load, State relief administration, Madera County

	1937	1938	1939	1940		1937	1938	1939	1940
January	–1	59	287	998	July	9	83	470	------
February	41	155	603	------	August	13	91	458	------
March	99	281	844	------	September	7	51	407	------
April	98	308	863	------	October	3	47	381	------
May	27	242	738	------	November	3	21	581	------
June	16	90	550	------	December	13	70	726	------

Monthly indigent report, Madera County Welfare Department, December 1939

	Cases aided	Amount
Number of cases aided through surplus commodities	325	------------
Number of people aided through surplus commodities	706	------------
Number of cases aided through the commissary	173	------------
Number of people aided through the commissary	560	------------
Amount of groceries	--------	$1,065.22
Rent	--------	178.25
Utilities	--------	21.36
Wood (172½ tier)	--------	343.00
Kerosene (81 gallons)	--------	12.15
Ambulance service	--------	25.00
Medical	--------	98.01
Gasoline and oil	--------	71.49
Transportation	--------	27.40
Order for sundry supplies	--------	120.34
Cash paid by county to individuals other than State and Federal aid (15 cases, 19 people)	--------	280.00
Milk (fresh)	--------	12.40
Total in addition to surplus commodities, aged, blind, orphan, and hospitalization	--------	2,254.62
Hospitalization other than county hospital	--------	25.00
Burials (7)	--------	177.59
Cash paid by county to boarding homes for care of other than State and Federal aid (13 people)	--------	247.50
Grand total	--------	2,704.71
The following was paid for by labor through the Commissary for the month of December 1939:		
Groceries	--------	207.88
Number of families aided	21	------------
Number of people aided	88	------------

Monthly indigent report, Madera County Welfare Department, December 1939—Con.

	Cases aided	Amount
Summary:		
Total aid other than hospitalization		$2,912.59
Number of cases aided	188	
Average aid per case		15.49
Number of people aided	579	
Average aid per person		5.03

Acreage, production, and value of agricultural products, Madera County, 1939

[Compiled by Niels Overgaard, county agricultural commissioner, Court House, Madera, Calif.]

FRUIT AND NUT CROPS

	Bearing acreage	Nonbearing acreage	Total production	Total f. o. b. value
Almonds	338.1	76.7	183 tons	$43,920
Apples	70.6		232 tons	4,640
Apricots	877.2	60.4	1,097 tons	153,580
Figs	[1] 618.6		618 tons	9,270
Grapes:				
Wine	3,078.9	23.8	17,242 tons	258,630
Raisin	13,516.1	675.1	R—19,359 tons F—11,888 tons	880,230 146,380
Grapes, table	592.9		3,794 tons	41,730
Nectarines	169.0	22.0	1,217 tons	21,900
Olives	495.4	1.0	495 tons	31,940
Peaches:				
Clingstone	219.9	87.3	1,583 tons	31,660
Freestone	852.9	56.2	986 tons	138,040
Pears	2.9		15 tons	375
Plums	194.2	9.3	1,049 tons	26,225
Prunes	32 3		64 tons	4,480
Walnuts	11.8	6.0	11 tons	2,200
Total				1,795,200

TRUCK CROPS

	Bearing acreage	Nonbearing acreage	Total production	Total f. o. b. value
Asparagus	296.5		25,200 crates	$38,050
Berries	75.0		11,600 crates	34,800
Beets	28.2		127 tons	1,585
Beans	15.8		32 tons	2,110
Carrots	67.0		16,350 crates	20,600
Corn	100.0		450 tons	5,625
Cabbage	82.0		590 tons	9,145
Cauliflower	30.0		9,000 crates	4,500
Lettuce	93.0		10,230 crates	12,780
Melons:				
Watermelons	139.0		100,000 crates	10,600
Other	47.5		7,125 crates	6,410
Onions	30.3		360 crates	4,320
Peas	39.5		47 tons	3,570
Squash	10.3		46 tons	570
Spinach	63.3		367 tons	1,470
Tomatoes	282.0		2,820 tons	103,490
Miscellaneous vegetables	63.5		285 tons	3,560
Total				263,185

---

[1] Used ½ acreage as part of acreage is not cultivated.

F—Fresh.
R—Raisins.

Acreage, production, and value of agricultural products, Madera County, 1939—Con.

FIELD CROPS

	Acreage	Total production	Total f. o. b value
Alfalfa	11,322	55,090 tons	$413,170
Barley	57,174	38,116 tons	647,970
Beans	1,079	540 tons	42,660
Beets (sugar)	357	5,648 tons	28,805
Cotton	44,900	Lint, 56,845 bales	2,586,000
		Seed, 25,300 tons	693,000
Corn:			
Indian	560	2,520 tons	31,500
Grain sorghum	3,281	2,460 tons	63,960
Flax	2,720	1,210 tons	68,970
Grain hay	4,027	4,027 tons	35,030
Oats	1,599	576 tons	13,830
Potatoes	949	7,118 tons	142,360
Potatoes, sweet	136	339 tons	10,850
Wheat	22,694	10,212 tons	265,510
Total			5,043,615

MISCELLANEOUS

Nursery stock	71	419,250 fruit trees 680,000 vines 9,000 shade trees 1,200 ornamentals	$54,845
Bees (colonies)	4,000	100,000 pounds honey	4,250
		2,000 pounds wax	400
United States adjustment and conservation payments (mostly cotton).			663,955
Total			723,450

SUMMARY

Total value of—	
Fruit and nut crops	$1,795,200
Truck crops	263,185
Field crops	5,043,615
Miscellaneous	723,450
	7,825,450

Source of information:
Own office records and personal contacts.
Agricultural Conservation Association through courtesy of the county secretary.
Reports of State Department of Agriculture Crop Reporting Service.

California State Chamber of Commerce Data To Be Obtained by Counties in the San Joaquin Valley for Agricultural Committee Meeting on February 2, 1940, Californian Hotel

HOUSING

A. Do you have in your county—
1. Government camps?
2. County camps?
3. Camps constructed by farmer or shipper organizations?
4. Squatter camps?

B. Was there a deficiency of housing for migrants in your county during the peak harvest periods?

C. Is there a deficiency of housing for migrants?

D. Would farmers in your county be interested in obtaining Government loans at a low rate of interest for construction of housing for farm workers—
1. On farms?
2. In community camps?

EDUCATION

A. Has school population in your county materially increased in recent years?
B. Are school facilities adequate for handling migrant children?
C. Has overcrowding by migrant children affected the efficiency of teaching?
D. Is there discrimination toward migrant children?
E. Is there discrimination toward migrant adults?

ECONOMIC DATA

A. How many farms were there in your county in 1920, 1930, 1935?

B. In 1935 had the average acreage of farms increased or decreased since 1930–40?

C. Are there opportunities in your county for migrants to become—
  1. Farm tenants?
  2. Farm owners?

D. Is it likely that during the next few years more farm workers or less farm workers will be required for your county?

RELIEF AND MEDICAL CARE

1. What is the State Relief Administration case load and what is the county indigent case load at the present time, and for comparative purposes what was it 6 months ago, a year ago, and 2 years ago?
2. What proportion of the case load in each instance above is composed of what might be termed long-time residents of the county as compared to those which might be termed migrants?
3. From the viewpoint of administration, and its effect on the case load, have there been any important major changes in administration policies in the last 6 months or year with regard to making relief available to applicants—both of a migratory and more permanent group?
4. Have there been any policies established or carried out by local relief administrators regarding any rules or regulations making those on relief available for private employment opportunities when they arise?
5. To what extent does private enterprise work through the unemployment service or relief administration people in attempting to secure workers when job opportunities develop?
6. Had any qualitative analysis been made of the personnel on relief rolls to determine their occupational classification or abilities from the viewpoint of attempting to measure how many are fitted and able to meet the seasonal work requirements of the district?

Mr. Abbott. I wish to introduce a statement by the Agricultural Labor Bureau of San Joaquin Valley, Inc.

(The statement mentioned reads as follows:)

Statement of the Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Incorporated

The committee has been questioning witnesses as to the methods used by the farmers in determining wage levels in such commodities as the cotton industry in the San Joaquin Valley. Dr. Rowell, of the staff, directed such a question to a farm organization, saying that the committee should have such information in their records.

The Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc., is an organization formed for the mutual benefit of its members; to procure and distribute agricultural and other labor in the San Joaquin Valley and in the State of California. (Attached to this statement is a copy of the articles of incorporation of the organization and we ask that same be made a part of the records of your hearing.)

In connection with setting basic wage levels by the growers in the chopping and picking of cotton, the agricultural labor bureau has served for several years past merely as an instrument to call the growers to a meeting at a designated place when such a meeting has been requested by the growers themselves. We do not in any way determine or recommend any wage for any commodity either agricultural or otherwise, as it is a meeting for growers only to determine what wage they should pay.

The growers use the facilities of our office to extend invitations to growers in the valley to attend a meeting to discuss a basic wage. One other service is performed by the labor bureau at the request of the growers; that is, we send telegrams to the other cotton producing areas of the Nation, asking them to advise us of the rate of pay for cotton picking in their respective localities. The answers to these telegrams are then read to the growers when they meet here. (We here append copies of telegrams received this season and ask that these telegrams be made a part of the records.) That is the extent of our participation in the setting of wages.

Further, we can tell you this from our observations of these meetings: The growers at their meetings consider the cost of living, the price of the commodity, and their ability to pay. Then they vote upon a basic wage which is to be paid if the crop is in good condition; and the pickers are furnished with housing accommodations gratis. The vote upon a basic wage is merely a recommended level. The growers finally instruct the agricultural labor bureau of this recommendation and the board of directors of the bureau in the past have always accepted this recommendation and have so notified their members.

It is well to call specifically to the committee's attention that the word "basic" is used advisedly here because there is nothing in the recommendation which requires a farmer to pay only that wage. In many instances where the cotton is not clean, a poor crop, or accommodations are not furnished, higher levels are maintained.

Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
F. J. Palomares, *Manager*.

Fresno, Calif., *September 26, 1940*.

Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association, Inc.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., August 23, 1940.

Mr. F. J. Palomares,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Dear Sir: Answering your wire of the 21st, the crop in Oklahoma is fully a month late, and as yet there has been no report of the rate of wages to be paid for the picking of cotton this season.

However, the rate probably will be 75 cents per hundredweight for picking and 60 cents for snapping.

Very truly yours,

P. E. Harrill, *General Manager.*

The Cotton and Cotton Oil Press,
August 22, 1940.

Mr. F. J. Palomares,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley,
Fresno, Calif.

Dear Mr. Palomares: I am very sorry that there was a delay in answering your wire of the 21st, asking for information as to the cotton-picking rate in this section.

I wired the secretary of the Rio Grande Valley Ginners' Association at San Benito, and he replied that the highest price being paid in that section at the present time for picking cotton is 50 cents per hundred. They do not pull or sled cotton in that section.

As yet cotton picking has not started in the central, north, or western portions of the State.

Trusting that this information will be of service to you, as I was very happy indeed to furnish it, I am

Yours very truly,

R. Haughton, *President.*

[Telegrams]

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Best information can get, picking rate ranges 60 to 75 cents hundredweight according various conditions.

T. J. KIDD.

FORREST CITY, ARK.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Please pardon delay answering your wire 21st but as no cotton will be picked this section for 2 to 3 weeks have had to canvass the situation thoroughly. Considerable labor agitation this section but general opinion is that cotton picking will start at from 50 to 60 cents per hundredweight seed cotton and gradually work up to 75 cents.

PHILIP HICKEY.

MEMPHIS, TENN.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Picking begins here probably September 10 or 15. No indication now of picking charge

CHAS. G. HENRY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau, San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Picking rate in Louisiana 50 cents per hundredweight.

N. C. WILLIAMSON,
President, American Cotton Cooperative Association.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley,
Fresno, Calif.:

Re your wire cotton picking rate. Cotton picking hasn't started here. No definite rate established but 50 cents per hundredweight indicated.

W. P. THORPE,
Secretary, Dona Ana County Farm and Live Stock Bureau.

JACKSON, MISS.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau, San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Answering; crop late, picking not started, probable rate 50 to 75 cents hundredweight Stop Low price for seed this territory will mean low price for picking.

Regards,

G. M. LESTER.

DALLAS, TEX.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

In Texas Rio Grande Valley section highest price paid for picking cotton at present time is 50 cents hundred. Too early for central section of State. Delay caused by absence from city.

R. HAUGHTON
Cotton and Cotton Oil Press.

MACON, GA.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

No direct information but understand 40 to 50 cents hundred weight general.

BUCKEYE COTTON OIL CO.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agriculture Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Retel 50 cents per hundred.

C. E. DUKES,
South Carolina Cotton Cooperative Association.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX.

J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Current rates cotton picking Texas 50 to 60 cents hundredweight.

W. E. MORGAN.

STILLWATER, OKLA., *August 23.*

F. J. PALOMARES,
Manager, Agricultural Labor Bureau, San Joaquin Valley, Inc.,
Fresno, Calif.:

Best indicated rate per hundredweight for cotton picking 60 to 75 cents.

W. A. CONNER, *State agent.*

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION, AGRICULTURAL LABOR BUREAU OF THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

Know All Men by These Presents:

That we, the undersigned, a majority of whom are citizens and residents of the State of California, have this day voluntarily associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming, and do hereby form, a nonprofit cooperative corporation under the laws of the State of California and we do hereby certify:

FIRST. That the name of said corporation shall be AGRICULTURAL LABOR BUREAU OF THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY.

SECOND. That the purposes for which said corporation is formed are:

(*a*) To operate for the mutual benefit of its members; to procure and distribute agricultural and other labor within the San Joaquin Valley and in the State of California; to render any service and/or provide any facilities in any manner connected with, or conducive to the foregoing.

(*b*) To buy, hold, operate, manage, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of, or otherwise obtain and exercise all privileges of ownership of such real and/or personal property including but not restricted to trade-marks, copyrights, patents, and/or shares of stock as may be consistent or convenient to conduct and/or carry out any one or more of the purposes or objects for which this corporation is formed, or for any of its business.

(*c*) To appoint such agents and officers as its business may require and such appointed agents may be either persons or corporations; to admit persons to membership in the corporation and to expel any member pursuant to the provisions of its bylaws; to forfeit the membership of any member for violation of any agreement between him and the corporation or for his violation of its bylaws.

(d) To borrow money, and to make and issue notes, bonds, debentures, obligations, and other evidences of indebtedness of all kinds, whether secured or otherwise, and to secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise and generally to make and perform agreements and contracts of every kind and nature; to loan money with or without security and to take mortgages, pledges, and/or other securities of real and/or personal property to secure said loans.

(*e*) To do any and everything necessary, suitable and proper for the accomplishment of any of the purposes, or attainment of any one or more of the objects herein enumerated, or conducive to and expedient with the interests of this corporation, and to contract accordingly, and in addition to excerise and possess all powers, rights, and privileges necessary or incident to the powers for which the corporation was organized, or to the activities to which it is engaged; and in addition, any other rights, powers, and privileges granted by the laws of this state to other corporations, except such as are inconsistent with the express provisions of the laws under which this corporation is organized.

THIRD. That the place where the principal business of said corporation is to be transacted is the City of , County of , State of California.

FOURTH. That the term for which said corporation shall exist is fifty years from and after the date of its incorporation.

FIFTH. That the number of directors of said corporation shall be nine (9) and the names and address of those selected for the first year and until their successors shall have been elected and shall have accepted office are as follows:

S. P. Frisselle, Fresno, California.
A. J. Sturtevant, Jr., Fresno, California.
Stanley R. Pratt, Bakersfield, California.
A. R. Linn, Merced, California.
E. W. Williams, Madera, California.
J. W. Guiberson, Corcoran, California.
J. A. Pauly, Bakersfield, California.
Guy Windrem, Madera, California.
Guy E. Leonard, Fresno, California.

SIXTH. That the voting power and property rights and interests of each member in the corporation shall be equal and the corporation shall have power to admit new members who shall be entitled to vote and to share in the property of the corporation in accordance with law and the bylaws of said corporation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF: we have hereunto set our hands and seal this 13 day of April 1926.

(Signed) S. P. Frisselle, A. J. Sturtevant, Jr., Stanley R. Pratt, A. R. Linn, E. W. Williams, J. W. Guiberson, J. A. Pauly, Guy Windrem, Guy E. Leonard.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Fresno, ss:

On this 13th day of April in the year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-six before me, Valberg M. Gulliksen, a Notary Public in and for the said County and State, personally appeared S. P. Frisselle, A. J. Sturtevant, Jr., Stanley R. Pratt, A. R. Linn, E. W. Williams, J. W. Guiberson, J. A. Pauly, Guy Windrem, Guy E. Leonard, known to me to be the persons whose names are subscribed to the within instrument and they duly acknowledged to me that they executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

(Signed) VALBERG M. GULLIKSEN,
Notary Public in and for said County and State.

(The following statement was prepared by Edwin Bates, who cooperated in the California investigation, at the request of the committee and accepted for the record.)

MIGRATION INTO CALIFORNIA IN THE 1920'S

(BY EDWIN BATES)[1]

So many fast-moving events were crowded into American life in the 1920's that we were not aware of the greatest migration of our history while we could still take a look at it.

---

[1] The author is an economist and former newspaperman who has made several studies of the economic development of the Pacific Coast States. This analysis of migration to California in the 1920's, originally made several years ago, has been revised and is published here for the first time.

It didn't occur to us perhaps that 2,000,000 people moving to California within a decade was a great migration because it lacked the dramatic values, the high adventure, of earlier migrations. The traditional pattern is one of pioneers pushing on to new lands to build homes or of the feverish excitement that runs along the trail to the new gold strike.

We carry into a new age the historical patterns of the old; and the 1920's in many respects were a new age. The tempo of life was stepped up tremendously. Scientific advances, creating many new products, were changing our habits of life. Most important was the automobile which provided the family with its own means of migration, the facility to move quickly, comfortably, and without following a timetable. The 1920's were the first decade in which a vast number of people had their own means of moving quickly, comfortably, quietly, from one end of the country to another; and they moved.

Actually, there were several migrations over the country in those years. There were important movements from the South to northern industrial centers; from the Middle West into Texas; a considerable movement into the Pacific Northwest, and, Nation-wide, a large migration from farms to cities.

The migration to California in the 1920's deserves special study as the greatest migration of our history, the first migration of the automotive age and perhaps the last migration stimulated to an important degree by community promotion.

It also deserves special study because it has generally been neglected as an important economic development. Much has been heard of the number of migrants who converged on California in the 1930's and the difficulties of fitting them into the State's economy. But what of the 1920's when twice as many migrants came into the State? How well did the State absorb that migration? And to what extent was the migration of the 1930's due to the momentum set up in the 1920's?

A migrant usually is a person who is looking for a home to live in and a job to live by.

Where did the more than 2,000,000 who moved to California in the 1920's find their homes? And how did they make a living once they arrived? There must have been hundreds of thousands of them with definite home or job assignment when they crossed the State boundary.

An economic event, such as the migration to California, is measurable in statistics of city and rural growth of the number of people living in a community in 1930 as compared with 1920 or of the jobs at which they worked. But people are not statistics. And in those drier areas of analysis where we measure the results of the migration we should be aware that we are still dealing with people.

We deal here with probably three-quarters of a million American families; with people who left their homes to find something better in California. We can presume they would not have gone without some hope of a job, a more comfortable place to live, greater personal happiness, or some personal or material gain.

They came into California from every part of the country; from the plateau and desert areas of the Mountain States where there is little chance of population growth; from the Great Plains and the Corn Belt where post-war deflation of land values and reduced farm incomes created considerable unrest; from the farms, the small towns, and cities of the Ohio Valley; from the southern Cotton Belt and the great industrial centers of the East.

Among the migrants to California in the 1920's were farmers, professional men, retailers, real-estate agents, oil-field workers, promoters in oil and real estate, office workers, barbers, waiters, actors and actresses on their way to Hollywood, carpenters, bricklayers and plasterers to build homes in fast-growing subdivisions, and a complete cross-section of the highly varied pattern of American life.

SOME QUICK MEASUREMENTS

In 1930 California had about two-thirds more men, women, and children than in 1920, an increase far beyond that of any other State during the decade. In actual numbers California's residents increased by 2,250,390 during the 1920's. In actual gain California also exceeded all other States; New York, in second place, increased by 2,202,839.

A State gains population in two ways: By an excess of births over deaths and by bringing more people in than leave. In the 1920's California's births exceeded deaths by 230,895. If we set the natural increase against the total growth of 2,250,390, it is obvious that California gained more than 2,000,000 persons by the in-migration.

Considering the number who moved away after taking up a contemplated permanent residence, it is obvious that the influx of migrants must have been well above 2,000,000.

A COMPARISON WITH EARLY POPULATION GROWTH

The importance of this migration is shown by measuring it against the growth of the State in earlier years. When the first census was taken in 1850, the year California became a State, an incomplete coverage showed a population of 92,597. The actual number may have been as large as 125,000. In 1920, 60 years later, the population has grown to 2,377,549. The gain in the 60 years was therefore about 2,250,000.

In those years California emerged from a frontier country. Railroads were built; rich resources in timber, metals, and farm lands were brought under development; towns and cities grew; steamers and sailing ships using the old route around the Horn—the Panama Canal wasn't opened until 1914—were carrying California products to many parts of the world.

One migration followed another in the 60 years from 1850 to 1910. But the increase in those 60 years was no larger than from 1920 to 1930. Turning the statement around, we can say that California absorbed as many people in the boom era of the 1920's as in the first 60 years of its development from a frontier State.

In 1920 California was eighth in population; by 1930 it had passed Massachusetts and Michigan and was sixth. And by 1940 it had passed Texas and was practically in a tie with Ohio for fourth place.

A quick glance at the census figures reveals that the migration into California in the 1920's did not follow one important feature of all frontier migrations. The frontier has been exploited by men; they have greatly outranked the number of women. As late as 1910 California had one-fourth more males than females in its population.

During the 1920's the increase in California was almost evenly divided between males and females. The male population increased by 1,129,004 and the female by 1,121,386. The figures indicate that this must have been a migration of families. Otherwise, there would not have been the close division between males and females in the State's increase.

There has also been a popular impression that the migration to California in the 1920's was mostly aged persons seeking retirement in a land of comfortable living. The figures show no indication of this. Age distribution by major age groups for California for 1920 and 1930 as compared with the national averages of those years is shown in table I.

TABLE I.—*Percentage distribution by major age groups of California's population as compared with the national average, 1920 and 1930*

Age group	California		National averages	
	1930	1920	1930	1920
Under age 19	30.4	30.9	38.8	40.7
20 to 34 years	25.6	25.9	24.3	25.0
35 to 54 years	29.2	29.1	24.6	23.4
55 to 64 years	8.2	7.9	6.9	6.2
65 years and over	6.4	5.9	5.4	4.6
Age unknown	.2	.3	.1	.1

California's population for many years has had less young people and a higher percentage of aged persons than the national average. At the same time the percentage of aged persons in the Nation's population has been increasing. The above table indicates that the proportion of persons in various age groups in California did not change appreciably between 1920 and 1930. The rate of change in the upper age groups in California was actually less than in the national average.

Southern California cities in the 1920's showed either no gains in percentage of aged or an actual decline at the end of the decade. Thus, Los Angeles with a heavy population increase in the 1920's showed 6.2 percent of its population of age 65 or over in 1930, the same figure as for 1920. In Long Beach 10.9 percent of the population was 65 or more in 1920 and 9.2 percent in 1930. San Diego showed 9.2 percent of its population of age 65 or more in 1920 and 9.1 percent in 1930.

Some high lights, therefore, of this migration are already clear. It was by all odds the largest internal migration of our history. That it was not a typical migration for frontier expansion is shown by the almost even division between males and females in the population increase of the State. Finally, it was not, as has been popularly believed, a migration dominated by aged persons.

A FRAME FOR THE PICTURE

Every economic development must be studied within the framework of contemporary events. What were the factors that promoted this greatest internal migration of our history? What were the appeals which drew more than 2,000,000 people to California?

Of some things in this picture we can be quite certain. The 1920–30 decade was one of the most speculative of American history. Several important industries—automotive, electrical, and radio, for example—made rapid strides in those years. It was really in the 1920's that the Nation felt the first full impact of the automotive age with millions of families now owning a vehicle that would take them across the country in less than a week. The mobility of the population increased tremendously. States and communities saw new sources of income in the tourist trade and began advertising their wares, thus stimulating mobility.

Although employment increased in some of the newer industries in the 1920's, the general trend of employment in all basic industries was downward. Agriculture, mining, forestry and fishing showed a smaller number of workers in 1930 than 10 years earlier although population in the meantime had increased more than 16 percent. These trends in employment throughout the country are shown in table II.

TABLE II.—*Persons gainfully employed in the 10 major occupation groups in 1920 and 1930 with actual increase and percentage of increase in each group in the 10-year period*

Occupation group	Increase	Percentage of increase in the 10 years	Occupation group	Increase	Percentage of increase in the 10 years
Total 1920: 41,614,248	7, 215, 672	17. 3	Trade	1, 823, 783	42. 8
Total 1930: 48,829,920			Public service (not elsewhere classified)	117, 680	15. 9
Agriculture	−193, 814	−1. 8	Professional service	1, 082, 633	49. 9
Forestry and fishing	−19, 745	−7. 3	Domestic and personal service	1, 572, 456	46. 5
Extraction of minerals	−105, 900	−9. 7	Clerical occupations	913, 488	29. 4
Manufacturing and mechanical industries	1, 278, 773	10. 0			
Transportation and communication	746, 318	24. 1			

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Sharp increases were shown in the 1920's in all lines of white-collar and service employments. It was an era in which sales promotion and publicity increased tremendously. To an important degree the upswing in white-collar and service employments was stimulated by the rapid increase in urban population and by decreasing opportunity for employment in basic industries.

There was an important cityward movement in the 1920's. Urban population in the United States increased by 14,796,850 between 1920 and 1930, a gain of 27.3 percent, while rural population rose only 2,267,576, a gain of 4.4 percent. Population on farms declined by 3.8 percent.

Rich oil strikes in the 1920's added greatly to speculative activity. Crude oil production rose rapidly; the output in 1930 was a little more than twice that of 1920. Migrations followed the oil strikes as they had the gold and silver strikes of other years. The southern California oil boom was a highly important factor in promoting migration into that area. In 1921 Los Angeles County produced 12,396,000 barrels of crude oil; by 1923 the output had shot up to 158,665,000 barrels. Some of the rich strikes in the county were made on town lots, thus spreading the benefits to thousands of people.

While business indexes moved upward during the 1920's, there was considerable unrest in the Farm Belt where many farmers were caught by the post-war deflation of farm prices and sharp decline in land values.

All these developments are the framework within which the California migration took place: Widespread speculative activity, real estate and oil booms, increased mobility of population, rapid urbanization, decline in basic industry employment, post-war deflation in agriculture and a sharp upturn in white-collar and service jobs.

Many California communities also put on advertising campaigns to promote population growth. Aside from the oil boom and growth of the motion-picture industry, there had been no important industrial expansion to attract people seeking employment. Population promotion was based on a theory that as a community expands it is certain to gain industries to supply the necessary payrolls for its existence.

INCREASE IN FOREIGN-BORN

Foreign-born residents in California's population increased by 316,339 during the 1920's, more than one-third of which were Mexicans of foreign birth.

No estimate can be made from census reports of the increase in the State due to direct migration to California from abroad. The number of foreign-born whites in the State increased from 681,662 in 1920 to 810,034 in 1930, a gain of 128,372. At the same time the number of naturalized citizens in this group increased by 133,513. A considerable part of the naturalized citizens had presumably lived in other States and been naturalized before moving to California.

The number of aliens in the State's population decreased by 28,341 during the decade while the number who had taken out first papers increased by 34,905.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GETS 72 PERCENT OF INCREASE

Los Angeles County absorbed 56.5 percent of the State's population gain of the 1920's and the nine additional counties of southern California absorbed 15.5 percent.

The increase in Los Angeles County in the 1920's was 1,272,037. The significance of this increase for one county can best be understood by comparing it with increases in important States. During the 1920's Michigan gained 1,173,913 or about 100,000 less people than Los Angeles County. Furthermore, Michigan stood third among the States, exceeded only by California and New York. Texas was fourth with a gain of 1,161,487 and Illinois fifth with an increase of 1,145,374.

The other principal center of population in California is the San Francisco Bay district, comprising nine counties. The total increase in these counties in the 1920's was 395,098 or 17.6 percent of the State's increase.

Southern California and the San Francisco Bay district, therefore, absorbed about 90 percent of the State's increase. While these two sections increased in population, with Los Angeles County far in the lead, vast areas of the State, particularly mountainous and desert areas, gained a mere handful of people or lost population.

There are tremendous variations in California's natural resources and likewise in population density. A large State, the second largest of the Nation, it has, within its 155,000 square miles, vast stretches of mountainous and desert country with one or two persons per square mile. Some of these lightly populated areas are larger than many eastern States. While population was pouring into southern California in the 1920's, six counties of the State were losing population; some of the counties of declining population were in the Mother Lode country of the Sierra Nevadas, scene of the gold rush of '49.

URBAN AND RURAL GAINS

Less than 4 percent of the people who came to California in the 1920's settled on farms; the migration to the State was overwhelmingly to urban areas. The total increase of 2,250,390 was distributed as follows: Urban gain, 1,828,867, 81.2 percent of total; rural farm gain, 85,837, 3.8 percent of total; rural nonfarm, 335,686, 15 percent of total.

The rural nonfarm group on inspection is found to be much more urban in character than rural. This group includes: (1) Persons living in incorporated places of less than 2,500 population and (2) persons living in unincorporated places, but not on farms.

Out of a total rural nonfarm population of 937,305 in California in 1930 there were 154,284 in incorporated places of less than 2,500 and 783,021 in unincorporated territory, but not on farms. An analysis of the latter group indicates that most of them live in unincorporated suburban communities, are presumably dependent on urban employment, and certainly more urban than rural in character.

In all the highly urbanized counties of the State there is a large rural nonfarm group, very few of whom live in incorporated towns. Los Angeles County, a highly urbanized area, had a rural nonfarm population in 1930 of 249,548 of which only 8,137 lived in incorporated towns of less than 2,500. In Alameda County there was a rural nonfarm population of 25,340, but only 3,573 of these lived in incorporated places. Many similar instances show up in other populous counties of the State.

Considering the suburban character of most of the rural nonfarm people and their dependence on urban employment, it is obvious that the movement into California's urban districts was actually much higher than 81.2 percent of the total shown above. While no actual determination can be made of the extent to which the State's gain was urban and suburban, it does appear that probably 90 percent of it was.

We find, therefore, that the migration to California in the 1920's was an important part of the entire cityward movement of that decade.

BIG CITIES DOMINANT

In 1920 California was 68 percent urban; in 1930, 73.3 percent urban. Only five States in 1930—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, and Illinois—had a higher percentage of urban population than California. Contrary to the popular impression, California is more highly urbanized than Pennsylvania, Ohio, Connecticut, and Michigan.

California's five largest cities gained almost 1,000,000 people in the 1920's. Only New York City and Chicago have absorbed more people in a single decade than Los Angeles.

The population increase of Los Angeles, including two other urban areas annexed in the 1920's, was 661,375, a gain of 114.7 percent or approximately the same rate of growth as Detroit between 1910 and 1920. Chicago increased by 674,733 in the 1920's, exceeding Los Angeles by a small margin, but the rate of growth was substantially less.

The populations of California's five largest cities in 1930 are shown in table III.

TABLE III.—*Populations, 1920 and 1930, and 10-year increase of the 5 California cities of more than 100,000 population in 1930*

City	Population		Increase
	1930	1920	
Los Angeles [1]	1, 238, 048	591, 587	646, 461
San Francisco	634, 394	506, 676	127, 718
Oakland	284, 063	216, 261	67, 802
San Diego [2]	147, 995	78, 831	69, 164
Long Beach	142, 032	55, 593	86, 439
	2, 446, 532	1, 448, 948	997, 584

[1] The population figure of Los Angeles for 1920 has been increased by 14,914 to take account of 2 urban areas annexed to the city in the 1920's. These were Venice (10,385 in 1920), annexed in 1925, and Watts (4,529 in 1920), annexed in 1926.

[2] San Diego's 1920 population is increased here by 4,148 to take account of the annexation of East San Diego, an urban area, in 1923.

CITIES OF 25,000 TO 100,000

In 1930 California had 15 cities of between 25,000 and 100,000 population. Nine of these cities are in the 10 counties of southern California and 6 in the northern part of the State. These 15 cities had an aggregate increase of 280,948 in the 1920's. Their growth is shown in table IV.

TABLE IV.—*Populations, 1920 and 1930, and 10-year gain of 15 California cities between 25,000 and 100,000 in 1930*

City	1930	1920	10-year gain
Alameda	35,033	28,806	6.227
Alhambra	29,472	9,096	20,376
Bakersfield	26,015	18,638	7,377
Berkeley	82.109	56.036	26,073
Fresno	52,513	45,086	7,427
Glendale	62,736	13,536	49,200
Pasadena	76,086	45,354	30,732
Riverside	29,696	19,341	10,355
Sacramento	93,750	65,908	27,842
San Bernardino	37,481	18,721	18,760
San Jose	57.651	39,642	18,009
Santa Ana	30,322	15,485	14.837
Santa Barbara	33.613	19,441	14,172
Santa Monica	37,146	15,252	21,894
Stockton	47,963	40.296	7,667
Total	731,586	450.638	280,948

The six northern California cities in the above group—Alameda, Berkeley, Fresno, Sacramento, San Jose, and Stockton—showed an aggregate gain of 93,245 while the increase of the nine southern California cities was 187,703. The rates of increase in Glendale, Alhambra, Santa Monica, San Bernardino, and Santa Ana reflect the rapid urbanization in southern California in the 1920's.

CITIES OF 10,000 TO 25,000

In the 10,000 to 25,000 population group there were 24 California cities in 1930 which had also been classified as urban in 1920. These cities showed an aggregate gain of 156,259. The list of cities in table V does not include new incorporations nor rural towns which jumped into this classification during the 1920's.

TABLE V.—*Populations, 1920 and 1930, of 24 California cities of between 10,000 and 25,000 in 1930 which were urban in 1920*

City	Population		City	Population	
	1930	1920		1930	1920
Anaheim [1]	10,995	5,526	Redlands [1]	14,177	9,571
Brawley [1]	10,439	5,389	Richmond	20,093	16,843
Burbank [2]	16,662	2,913	Salinas	10,263	4,308
Burlingame	13,270	4,107	Ventura [1]	11,603	4,156
Eureka	15,752	12,923	San Leandro	11,455	5,703
Fullerton [1]	10,860	4,415	San Mateo	13,444	5,979
Huntington Park [2]	24,591	4,513	Santa Cruz	14,395	10,917
Inglewood [2]	19,480	3,286	Santa Rosa	10,636	8,758
Modesto	13,842	9,241	South Pasadena [2]	13,730	7,652
Monrovia [2]	10,890	5,480	Vallejo	14,476	16,845
Ontario [1]	13,583	7,280	Whittier [2]	14,822	7,997
Palo Alto	13,652	5,900			
Pomona [2]	20,804	13,505	Total	343,914	187,655

[1] In southern California outside Los Angeles County.
[2] In Los Angeles County.

NOTE:—This list does not include Beverly Hills and Compton which advanced from rural to urban classification during the 1920's; South Gate, incorporated between 1920 and 1930, and Gardena Township, classified as urban in 1930 under a special rule. These 4 urban centers, all between 10,000 and 25,000, are shown in other tables.

SMALL CITIES ALSO GROW

Almost 100,000 persons were added to California's urban population in the 1920's by the growth of cities of between 5,000 and 10,000. Table VI includes 39 cities in this group which were also classified as urban in 1920. Three additional cities of between 5,000 and 10,000 which changed from rural to urban in the 1920's are included in table VIII.

Most of the cities shown in table VI are in northern California. The aggregate population gain in these cities was 99,869.

Table VI.—*Populations, 1920 and 1930, of 39 California cities of between 5,000 and 10,000 in 1930 which were classified as urban in 1920*

City	Population		City	Population	
	1930	1920		1930	1920
Calexico [1]	6, 299	6, 223	Piedmont	9, 333	4, 282
Chico	7, 961	9, 339	Pittsburg	9, 610	4, 715
Colton [1]	8, 014	4, 282	Porterville	5, 303	4, 097
Corona [1]	7, 018	4, 129	Redondo Beach [2]	9, 347	4, 913
Coronado [1]	5, 425	3, 289	Redwood City	8, 962	4, 020
Daly City	7, 838	3, 779	Roseville	6, 425	4, 477
El Centro [1]	8, 434	5, 464	San Fernando [2]	7, 567	3, 204
Hanford	7, 028	5, 888	San Gabriel [2]	7, 224	2, 640
Hayward	5, 530	3, 487	San Luis Obispo [1]	8, 276	5, 895
Lodi	6, 788	4, 850	San Rafael	8, 022	5, 512
Martinez	6, 569	3, 858	Santa Clara	6, 302	5, 220
Marysville	5, 763	5, 461	Santa Maria [1]	7, 057	3, 943
Merced	7, 066	3, 974	Santa Paula [1]	7, 452	3, 967
Monterey	9, 141	5, 479	South San Francisco	6, 193	4, 411
Monterey Park [2]	6, 406	4, 108	Tulare	6, 207	3, 539
Napa	6, 437	6, 757	Visalia	7, 263	5, 753
National City [1]	7, 301	3, 116	Watsonville	8, 344	5, 013
Orange [1]	8, 066	4, 884	Woodland	5, 542	4, 147
Oxnard [1]	6, 285	4, 417			
Pacific Grove	5, 558	2, 974	Total	281, 601	181, 732
Petaluma	8, 245	6, 226			

[1] In southern California outside Los Angeles County.

[2] In Los Angeles County.

While most of the large California cities grew rapidly in the 1920's several small urban centers of between 2,500 and 5,000 grew much more slowly. In 1930 there were 21 cities of between 2,500 and 5,000 which had been classified as urban in the 1920 census. In the 10 years their aggregate populations increased from 62,756 to 74,806, a gain of 12,050 or a little more than 19 percent. These cities represent a very small part of the State's urban growth and are not separately shown.

NEW CITIES ARE BORN

Eight new cities were created in Los Angeles County during the 1920's. One of these, South Gate, incorporated in 1923, had a population of 19,632 in 1930. In addition to these eight incorporations Belvedere and Gardena Townships, also in Los Angeles County, were added to urban areas of the State in 1930 under a new census rule. The only other new incorporation in the urban group during the decade was Willow Glen in Santa Clara County.

These new incorporations and the two townships classified as urban add 117,089 to the State's urban increase in the 1920's. The populations of these 11 cities and urban areas in 1930 are shown in table VII.

Table VII.—*Population of nine California cities incorporated during the 1920's and of two urban areas created by special census rule*

City of urban area:	*1930 population*	City of urban area—Con.	*1930 population*
Bell	7, 884	Torrance	7, 271
Hawthorne	6, 596	Willow Glen	4, 167
Lynwood	7, 323	Belvedere Township	33, 023
Maywood	6, 794	Gardena Township	15, 969
Montebello	5, 498		
Signal Hill	2, 932	Total	117, 089
South Gate	19, 632		

TOWNS BECOME CITIES

When an incorporated town goes beyond 2,500 it changes from rural to urban classification. During the 1920's, 40 California cities jumped from the rural to urban group and increased the State's urban population by 165,068.

Some of the cities showed very rapid rates of increase, particularly those of Los Angeles County, which mushroomed as a result of rich oil strikes and growth of the motion-picture industry. Of the 40 towns under this heading 14 are in Los Angeles County, 10 in southern California outside Los Angeles County, and 16 in northern California. Nine of the northern California cities are in the San Francisco Bay district, the area of greatest population density in that section of the State. Only seven of these towns, therefore, are outside the heavily populated areas of the State.

In striking a balance of California's urban growth the 1930 population of these cities—and not the 1920–30 gains—are taken into account. The 40 towns which changed from rural to urban in the 1920's are shown in table VIII.

TABLE VIII.—*Populations in 1930 and 1920 of 40 California cities which changed from rural to urban classification in the 1920–30 decade*

City	1930 population	1920 population	City	1930 population	1920 population
Albany	8,569	2,462	Hermosa Beach [1]	4,796	2,327
Antioch	3,563	1,936	Huntington Beach [2]	3,690	1,687
Arcadia [1]	5,216	2,239	La Mesa [2]	2,513	1,004
Auburn	2,661	2,289	LaVerne [1]	2,860	1,698
Azusa [1]	4,808	2,460	Livermore	3,119	1,916
Banning [2]	2,752	1,810	Lompoc [2]	2,845	1,876
Beverly Hills [1]	17,429	674	Los Gatos	3,168	2,317
Chino [2]	3,118	2,132	Mountain View	3,308	1.888
Chula Vista [2]	3,869	1,718	Oceanside [2]	3,508	1,161
Claremont [1]	2,719	1,728	Paso Robles	2,573	1,919
Compton [1]	12,516	1,478	Reedley	2.589	2,447
Covina [1]	2,774	1,999	San Anselmo	4,650	2,475
Culver City [1]	5,669	503	San Bruno	3,610	1,562
Delano [2]	2,632	805	San Marino [1]	3,730	584
El Cerrito	3,870	1,505	Sierra Madre [1]	3.550	2,026
El Monte [1]	3,479	1,283	Sunnyvale	3,094	1,675
El Segundo [1]	3,503	1,563	Tracy	3,829	2,450
Escondido [2]	3,421	1,789	Ukiah	3,124	2,305
Exeter	2,685	1,852	Yuba City	3,605	1,708
Fillmore [2]	2,893	1,597			
Glendora [1]	2,761	2,028	Total	165,068	70,875

[1] In Los Angeles County.
[2] In southern California outside Los Angeles County.

CITIES ANNEXED TO OTHER CITIES

Three cities, classified as urban in 1920, were annexed to other cities previous to 1930. These included East San Diego with 4,148 in 1920, annexed to San Diego; Venice, with a population of 10,385 in 1920, annexed to Los Angeles; and Watts, with 4,529 in 1920, also annexed to Los Angeles. In table III the 1920 populations of San Diego and Los Angeles were increased to offset these annexations. This adjustment was necessary to set up the summary of urban increases shown in table IX.

URBAN GROWTH SUMMARIZED

The total urban increase in California in the 1920's was 1,828,867. Well over half of this increase was in the 5 largest cities of the State and about 70 percent of it was in the 20 largest cities. Of these 20 cities, all of more than 25,000 in 1930, 6 are in Los Angeles County, 6 in southern California outside Los Angeles County, and 8 in northern California.

These 20 cities added 1,278,532 persons to California urban population. Of this increase the 12 southern California cities gained 989,767 and the 8 northern California cities 288,765.

A summary of the State's urban growth in the decade is shown in table IX.

TABLE IX.—*Summary of urban population increase in California between 1920 and 1930*

Groups of cities, etc.	Increase	Percent of State's net urban gain
5 cities of over 100,000	997, 584	54. 5
15 cities of 25,000 to 100,000	280, 948	15. 4
24 cities of 10,000 to 25,000	156, 259	8. 5
39 cities of 5,000 to 10,000	99, 869	5. 5
21 cities of 2,500 to 5,000	12, 050	. 7
11 cities and new urban areas created between 1920 and 1930	117, 089	6. 4
40 towns which changed from rural to urban classification	165, 068	9. 0
Total urban increase, 1920–30	1, 828, 867	100

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Decennial Census, Population Statistics of California, Second Series, 1930.

CALIFORNIA'S METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS

So far we have indicated the urbanization of California in the 1920's by listing the growth of cities. This gives an accurate picture of the trend, but it does not reveal the extent to which people are massed in and around the principal cities of the State.

The best measure of the massing around larger cities is found in the study of metropolitan dis ricts of the United States prepared by the Bureau of the Census from 1930 census returns.

A metropolitan district comprises one or more central cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants and all adjacent and contiguous civil divisions with 150 persons or more per square mile and also, as a rule, the civil divisions of less population density directly contiguous to the central cities or entirely or nearly surrounded by civil divisions with the required density. Each metropolitan district must have at least 100,000 people.

California has 5 of the 96 metropolitan districts of the country. Los Angeles was fourth among the metropolitan areas and the San Francisco-Oakland district was ninth.

About 71 percent of the State's population lived in the 5 metropolitan districts in 1930. This ratio was higher than in Pennsylvania, where there is a great massing of people around that State's 10 metropolitan districts.

The population of California's metropolitan districts in 1930 was as follows:

District:	*Population*
Los Angeles	2, 318, 526
San Francisco-Oakland	1, 290, 094
San Diego	181, 020
Sacramento	126, 995
San Jose	103, 428
Total	4, 020, 063

PUTTING SOME FACTS TOGETHER

It has been suggested here that a migrant is usually a person looking for a home to live in and a job to live by.

The statistics indicate pretty clearly where the more than 2,000,000 migrants who went to California in the 1920's found their homes. The tables have shown the growth of cities of various population groups and the gain in rural population. Some of the outstanding facts may be summarized as follows:

1. The migration of the 1920's which swept more than 2,000,000 people into California centered on Los Angeles County, which alone gained more people in the decade than Michigan, Texas, or Illinois.

2. Southern California counties absorbed 72 percent of the State's total increase; and the San Francisco Bay area, nine counties, absorbed almost 18 percent.

3. About 90 percent of the migrants to California in the 1920's settled in urban and suburban areas. An exact measure of suburban people, dependent on urban employment, cannot readily be computed, but the number is known to be very large.

4. Approximately 55 percent of the State's population growth was in the 5 largest cities of the State, and about 70 percent of it in the 20 largest cities.

5. Approximately 71 percent of all Californians lived in the five metropolitan areas of the State in 1930. This percentage exceeds that of Pennsylvania, which may be taken as a State that is fairly typical of population concentration along the industrialized eastern seaboard.

6. Only 3.8 percent of California's population increase in the 1920's was absorbed on farms.

7. While cities grow rapidly in southern California and around San Francisco Bay, large areas of the State, in fact, the frontier areas which claimed the migrations of other years, showed population losses or very slight increases.

MAKING A LIVING IN CALIFORNIA

How were 2,000,000 migrants fitted into the employment structure of California during the 1920's? Were jobs created fast enough to absorb the influx of people who were looking for work? How did the migration affect the employment structure of the State?

With about 90 percent of the migration moving to urban and suburban centers, we naturally expect to find most of the migrants absorbed in industry, trade, professional service, and other typical "city" jobs.

California, as has been shown, is a highly urbanized State, more highly urbanized, in fact, than such States as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Michigan.

For a general picture of the California employment structure in 1930 we can turn to the figures of the Bureau of the Census and compare the distribution of workers in broad general groups of occupations with the national average. This comparison is shown in table X.

TABLE X.—*Distribution of gainful workers 10 years old and over, by general divisions of occupations, in California as compared with the national average, 1930*

Division of occupations	Percentage distribution	
	United States	California
Agriculture	21.4	13.3
Forestry and fishing	.5	.5
Extraction of minerals	2.0	1.6
Manufacturing and mechanical industries	28.9	25.5
Transportation and communication	7.9	8.0
Trade	12.5	17.5
Public Service (not elsewhere classified)	1.8	2.4
Professional service	6.7	9.4
Domestic and personal service	10.1	11.8
Clerical occupations	8.2	10.1
Total	100.0	100.0

Source: Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Decennial Census, 1930.

Immediately obvious in table X is the much lower percentage of California workers engaged in basic industries in 1930 as compared with the national average and also the much greater proportion in California engaged in white-collar and service occupations.

While the State's population jumped by 65.7 percent in the 1920's, the number of factory wage earners increased only 19.4 percent. The comparisons are shown in table XI. A considerable part of the increases in wages and value added by manufacture came from oil refining and motion-picture production, which produce a high value of product in proportion to workers employed.

TABLE XI.—*Industrial development and population increase in California, 1920–30*

Factor:	*Percent of increase*
Population	65.7
Factory wage earners	19.4
Wages	38.6
Factory horsepower	105.1
Value added by manufacture	77.0

Source: United States Bureau of the Census.

The migrants who went to California in the 1920's were not attracted by rapidly expanding factory pay rolls as had been the case in migrations to middle western industrial centers after 1910. There was a very slow rise in factory wage earners in California when thousands of people seeking employment were coming into the State. In 1919 there were 243,692 factory wage earners in California; in 1921, a depression year, the number dropped to 197,608; by 1923, the number had increased to 245,416, or a little more than the 1919 level.

From 1923 to 1929 there were quite minor changes in some periods, particularly between 1923 and 1925 when the number of factory workers in the State increased only 4,136. At the peak of employment in 1929 California had 290,911 factory wage earners. From 1923 to 1929 while the 2,000,000 migrants were attempting to "settle down" and find some security of employment, the State's factory pay rolls increased by about 45,000 which meant new jobs for less than 8,000 additional factory workers each year.

LINES OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

In any city it can be observed that industrial development runs along two lines: (1) Local industries which serve the day-to-day needs of the local population and (2) industries which because of competitive advantages can produce for outside markets. A city gets its rating as an industrial center from the latter group of industries and not from the former.

In California during the 1920's there was the expected increase in local industries; these industries grew with the rapid urbanization of the State. It was not necessary to "attract" them.

These local industries include bakeries, ice-cream plants, laundries, newspaper plants, creameries, the smaller confectionery plants, and an important part of the business of sheet-metal shops, small foundries, planing mills, brick plants, and job printing shops. There must be some industry in every city to take care of local needs; but a city cannot survive on industries which meet local needs, any more than its people could make a living by taking in one another's washing.

Many of those who promoted the flow of migrants into California in the 1920's through real-estate speculation asserted industry would follow population growth. This approach reversed the usual pattern of city development; ordinarily, a city has worked for industrial and commercial development first; for improvement of its transportation facilities, banking structure, and other means of strengthening its industrial position; ordinarily there has been confidence that a city would get all the people it needed if it had pay rolls to attract them.

SERVICE AND WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS INCREASE RAPIDLY

A clear indication of what happened to California's employment structure by the 1920–30 migration is found in the census figures indicating that the major increases in occupational groups were in white-collar and service occupations.

During the 1920's, while California's population jumped 65.7 percent, the number of workers in professional service rose from 116,412 to 235,386—a gain of 102.2 percent; domestic and personal service workers increased from 154,841 to 294,075—a gain of 90 percent; employees in trade, mostly in selling, promoting, advertising, and retailing, increased from 209,399 to 436,619—a gain of 108.5 percent; workers in clerical occupations, bookkeepers, messengers, stenographers, typists, and others, increased from 133,405 to 253,320—a gain of 90 percent.

In the field of "public service (not elsewhere classified)," which includes policemen, firemen, soldiers, sailors, marines, and many city and county officials, there was an increase in the 10 years of 33.3 percent.

While white collar and service workers increased much faster than population the number of workers in agriculture, forestry, mining, fishing, manufacturing, building trades and transportation advanced only 43.1 percent. In 1920 there were 853,124 in these basic employments, according to the census figures, and 1,220,503 in 1930.

These figures give rather clear indications of the types of people who came to California in the 1920's. They indicate rather conclusively that the migration was not made up of wealthy, retired farmers from the Middle West nor of aged persons seeking a pleasant climate in which to spend their declining years. Most of the migrants of the 1920's, the figures seem to shout, were people who wanted jobs, mostly white collar and service jobs. A considerable number were professional people who could make their own jobs, or salesmen who could "promote" themselves jobs on a commission basis. Lack of employment opportunities in industry probably forced many of them to seek white collar jobs.

HOW CITIES LIVE

Graphic illustrations of the variations between the employment structure of California cities and eastern cities of comparable size are shown in a series of charts prepared in connection with this study.

Table XII shows the percentage of gainfully employed persons engaged in trade (principally in selling and sales promotion) in 1930 in the 12 largest cities of the country. In this case both Los Angeles and San Francisco show averages higher than other comparable cities with Los Angeles far above the general average. Several cities, it will be noted, are pretty close together: St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and New York, for example.

TABLE XII.—*Percent of gainfully occupied persons employed in trade in the 12 largest cities of the United States in 1930*

	Percent of gainfully employed workers engaged in trade		*Percent of gainfully employed workers engaged in trade*
New York	17. 4	St. Louis	16. 8
Chicago	17. 0	Baltimore	16. 0
Philadelphia	15. 6	Boston	16. 1
Detroit	13. 9	Pittsburgh	16. 9
Los Angeles	21. 8	San Francisco	18. 5
Cleveland	13. 8	Milwaukee	14. 8

Source: Bureau of the Census.

EXCESS OF PROFESSIONAL WORKERS

Another similar comparison, this one showing percentage of gainfully occupied persons engaged in professional service, is shown by table XIII. In this instance we find Los Angeles far ahead of all other cities in ratio of professional workers—physicians and surgeons, dentists, nurses, lawyers, engineers, teachers, authors, actors, artists, clergymen, musicians, and many others.

TABLE XIII.—*Percent of gainfully occupied persons employed in professional service in the 12 largest cities of the United States in 1930*

	Percent		*Percent*
New York	8. 0	St. Louis	6. 3
Chicago	6. 8	Baltimore	6. 8
Philadelphia	6. 6	Boston	8. 4
Detroit	6. 2	Pittsburgh	7. 7
Los Angeles	12. 2	San Francisco	8. 3
Cleveland	6. 4	Milwaukee	6. 7

Source: Bureau of the Census.

In Los Angeles, in 1930, 12.2 percent of the gainfully employed were professional service people whereas the average for most cities ranged between 6 and 8 percent. San Francisco showed a higher percentage of professional service workers than most cities, although not quite so high as Boston.

The number of professional workers in the United States rose rapidly in the 1920's: Trained nurses increased 97 percent; professional engineers 66 percent; lawyers 31 percent; architects 21 percent.

In 1920 professional workers were 5.2 percent of the Nation's gainfully employed; in 1930 they were 6.7 percent. The increase has been shown in table II.

In California, professional workers in 1930 were 9.4 percent of the State's gainfully employed, a ratio of 40 percent higher than the expanded national average of that year.

In 1930 there were 125 physicians and surgeons for each 100,000 of population in the United States; in California there were 172 per 100,000. The national average was 240 trained nurses per 100,000 people; in California 410 per 100,000.

Individual city figures are also interesting; San Francisco had 156 dentists per 100,000 people in 1930; Portland, Oreg., 148 per 100,000; Seattle 146; Los Angeles 118; San Diego 96; Chicago 95; New York 90; Pittsburgh 89; St. Louis 84; Boston 83; Philadelphia 80; Detroit 63, and Cleveland 59.

The national average for architects was 18 per 100,000 in 1930; California showed 35 per 100,000.

No quick conclusions should be drawn from these figures although they do indicate a heavy overload of professional workers in California as compared with national averages. California, however, stands well above the national average in her per capita purchasing power and per capita wealth and may reasonably be expected to support a higher ratio of professional workers in its population than many other States. A special study of the ratio of physicians, surgeons, and dentists to population of the several States in 1930 showed a high correlation with per capita retail sales.[1]

Restrictions against the free migration of professional workers did a great deal to hold down the number who came into California in the 1920's. In several professions California refuses reciprocity with other States, does not admit professional service migrants to practice until they have qualified under a State examination.

CLERICAL AND DOMESTIC AND PERSONAL SERVICE WORKERS

Two important occupations—clerical workers and domestic and personal service employees—increased by 90 percent in California during the 1920's. Here again the ratios to population in California as compared with the national averages tell about the same story as in professional and trade pursuits.

In 1930 the national average was 661 stenographers and typists per 100,000 of population; in California the average was 941 per 100,000. The national average of barbers, hairdressers, and manicurists per 100,000 population was 305; in California 443. Laundry operatives had a national average of 196 per 100,000 population; in California 346. At the same time California had 145 cleaning, dyeing, and pressing shop operators per 100,000 population while the national figure was 72.

Table XIV presents a graphic comparison of several of the ratios shown above.

TABLE XIV.—*Number of persons employed in various professional, trade, and domestic service pursuits in each 100,000 of population in California and the United States, 1930*

Occupation	Number per 100,000 of population		Occupation	Number per 100,000 of population	
	United States	California		United States	California
Physicians and surgeons	125	172	Stenographers and typists	661	941
Nurses	240	410	Barbers, hairdressers, and manicurists	305	443
Lawyers, judges, and justices	131	178	Carpenters	757	1,139
Salesmen and saleswomen	1,685	2,784			

Source: Bureau of the Census, 1930.

---

[1] See articles by the author in California and Western Medicine, San Francisco, February 1933, and in the Dental Gazette, San Francisco, February 1933. These articles show the ratio of physicians, surgeons, and dentists in the population of the States and major cities of the country and a comparison with per capita retail sales as shown by the Census of Distribution for 1929.

BUILDING TRADES WORKERS INCREASE

Building homes for an increase of 2,250,000 people in 10 years naturally attracted a large number of building trades workers. In 1930 the ratio of workers in this group to population in California was well above the national average. The California ratio for plasterers and cement finishers was more than twice the national average—144 per 100,000 as compared with 70. There were also considerably more carpenters in California in proportion to population—1,139 per 100,000 in California as compared with 750 nationally. Similar ratios hold for several other related lines.

CALIFORNIA'S INDUSTRIAL GROWTH IN THE 1920'S

California's industrial growth up to 1920 had been based almost entirely on the processing of native raw materials. An important canning industry had grown up with the expansion of the State's fruit and vegetable production; lumbering had been an important industry for many years; sugar refining, flour milling, clay products industries, fish canning, and many others using native products of the State's farms, mines, fisheries, and forests had built important pay rolls. Ship building and repairing have been important in some years.

With almost 2,000,000 persons migrating into the State in the 1920's, and about 90 percent of them taking up homes in urban and suburban communities, the need for broader industrial development soon became imperative. Chambers of commerce and industrial organizations began a drive to induce eastern manufacturers to locate branch plants in California to serve Pacific coast and oriental markets. In some lines these efforts were rather successful, particularly in the rubber industry and the assembling of automobiles. Of most importance, in view of recent developments in the present national defense program, was the development of aircraft production. The increase in aircraft production in the Los Angeles area is now doing a great deal to take up the lag in industrial pay rolls during the 1920's. There are several measures of California's lagging industrial development in 1930 which provide comparisons with other States and cities of the country. Because of its high urbanization it seems fair enough to make a comparison of factory employees in California's population with those of several other highly urbanized States.

The Census of Manufactures for 1929 showed 64 persons out of each 1,000 of population in California were engaged in manufacturing. This figure included factory workers, office employees, and salaried officials of manufacturing concerns. In comparison with the California figure of 64 in each 1,000 of population, North Carolina had 72; Wisconsin, 106; New York, 108; Illinois, 110; Pennsylvania, 121; Michigan, 125; Ohio, 129; Massachusetts, 152; and Connecticut, 180.

Again, there is no rigid yardstick, no ultimate standard, by which one can say a State with a certain degree of urbanization should have a certain share of its gainful workers engaged in manufacturing. There are other basic industries, providing pay rolls, which may be just as important. Here, however, the figures, as shown by table X, indicate that California is well below the national average in percentage of workers in agriculture and mining. In forestry and fishing, relatively small industries, the California figure corresponds closely with the national average. Transportation and communication, ordinarily regarded as a service industry although in many respects a basic industry, has approximately the same percentage of workers in California as in the national average.

This means, broadly considered, that California had no important basic industries in 1930 with a margin of employment beyond the national average to offset the deficiency in industrial pay rolls. Again, this is obvious when we look at the heavy excess of white collar and service employees in the California population.

SOME CITY COMPARISONS

Two sets of census data are available for comparing the industrial growth of California cities with other cities of the country. One set, based on returns from the population census, shows workers engaged in "manufacturing and mechanical industries," which includes all lines of industry and also the building trades. The second set of data is based on returns from the Census of Manufactures and includes workers engaged in manufacturing industries.

In table XV we have a comparison of the percentage of total workers engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries in 1930 in the 12 largest cities of the country. Four cities out of the 12—Detroit, Milwaukee, Cleveland, and Philadelphia—show more than 40 percent of their gainfully employed in manufacturing and mechanical industries. Three cities—Baltimore, St. Louis, and Chicago—have between 35 and 40 percent of their workers in these occupations. Los Angeles and San Francisco have the lowest percentages of the 12 cities, both cities being appreciably below New York and Boston, which had 32 percent of their workers in this group of occupations.

TABLE XV.—*Percent of gainfully occupied persons employed in manufacturing, and mechanical industries in the 12 largest cities of the United States in 1930*

	Percent		*Percent*
New York	32.0	St. Louis	36.9
Chicago	36.2	Baltimore	38.3
Philadelphia	40.2	Boston	32.0
Detroit	48.5	Pittsburgh	34.4
Los Angeles	26.2	San Francisco	27.1
Cleveland	44.3	Milwaukee	46.3

Source: Census of Population, 1930.

An accurate basis for comparing industrial development in and around the major cities of the country is found in statistics of the Census of Manufactures on an industrial area basis. Each industrial area has an important manufacturing city as its nucleus and includes the county in which the city is located, together with any adjoining county or counties with a great development of manufacturing industries. The industrial area should not be confused with the metropolitan districts to which reference has been made.

Statistics on number of establishments, wage-earner employment in manufacturing, wages paid, value of products, and value added by manufacturing are shown by the Bureau of the Census for 33 industrial areas of the United States for 1929. These figures give a good basis for comparing industrial employment and population of California cities in that year with other industrial areas of the country.

In ratio of wage earners to population the Los Angeles industrial area ranked lowest of the 33 industrial areas; there were 5,184 factory workers in the Los Angeles area in 1929 for each 100,000 of population, as compared with an average of 11,250 per 100,000 for the 33 areas of the country. The San Francisco-Oakland area in that year had 7,177 factory wage earners for each 100,000 of population, which was well below the average of the 33 areas.

A comparison of the Los Angeles and San Francisco-Oakland industrial areas with several other populous industrial areas of the country on the basis of wage earners to population is shown in table XVI.

TABLE XVI.—*Number of factory wage earners per 100,000 of population in the 10 most populous industrial areas of the United States, 1929*

	Number of factory wage earners per 100,000 of population		*Number of factory wage earners per 100,000 of population*
Los Angeles, Calif	5,184	St. Louis, Mo	11,558
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	7,177	Chicago, Ill	11,782
New York, N. Y	9,036	Philadelphia, Pa	11,986
Baltimore, Md	10,716	Detroit, Mich	13,952
Boston, Mass	10,936	Average of 33 industrial areas	11,250
Pittsburgh, Pa	11,230		

The Los Angeles area, however, rated much higher in a comparison of wages paid, value of products, and value added by manufacture. In wages paid, the Los Angeles area was twelfth, in value of products seventh, and in value added by manufacture ninth.

Two of the major industries of the Los Angeles area—motion-picture production and petroleum refining—have a high value of products and value added by manufacture in proportion to wage earners employed. Wages in these two industries are also high.

A note or two on this will illustrate the peculiarities of these industries: In 1929 petroleum refining in the United States employed 80,596 wage earners; but in value of products it exceeded the electrical machinery, apparatus, and supplies industries, which employed almost 329,000 workers; in value added by manufacture petroleum refining was close to the cotton-goods industry, which employed about 425,000 workers.

Motion-picture production in 1929 employed an average of 10,784 workers throughout the country, but the value added by manufacture was almost as great as in the hardware-manufacturing industry, which hired 52,306 workers.

CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT PICTURE SUMMARIZED

The picture of what 2,000,000 migrants did to the employment structure of California in the 1920's is now pretty clear. The migration was distinctly a cityward movement; it was made up of people who want jobs; the number of wealthy retired persons and aged people, presumably with some savings, who joined the migration seem lost in any figures readily available.

Workers in basic industries—in agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, and manufacturing—increased at a rate far below the State's population growth. At the same time the increase in white-collar and service workers jumped from about 90 to 110 percent in the 10 years.

Although we lack any ultimate standards by which we can say that the State should have had a certain number of industrial workers to stabilize its urbanization, we do get something tangible by comparing it with other States of similar concentration.

Aside from the oil strike and growth of the motion-picture industry, there were few economic developments in southern California to justify so large a migration.

Oil was by all means the most important factor in promoting the migration to southern California. Other things mushroomed up around it—new subdivisions, speculation in suburban farms, new plantings of citrus groves, a housing boom, the extension of utilities to scores of new communities.

Los Angeles, it should be remembered, is the largest American city to have a rich oil strike in its own backyard. Important discoveries were made in subdivisions, on city lots recently bought by newcomers from the Middle West. Back to the Great Plains and the Corn Belt, to relatives and old friends, went the news: "We've hit it rich * * * we've got a gusher * * * a thousand barrels * * * 5,000 barrels a day."

A new gold rush headed for California, a motorized migration, lacking the drama of '49, but spurred on by the same hope of quick fortunes.

BLACK GOLD AND ITS PAY ROLLS

While the search for oil goes on, there is employment for thousands in hauling supplies, building derricks, drilling, dressing tools; after it's found, there are pipe lines to be laid, tank farms to be built; later, refineries to convert the crude into finished products. But somewhere along the line employment begins to fall off, machinery takes over, there's now a handful of men where once there was a thousand.

The "black gold" flows; you don't have to blast it out of the rock every day or pan it from gravel. From a mile, almost 2 miles underground, the pumps boost it along its way through pipe lines to tank farms, to refineries, to tankers waiting in the harbor.

An oil boom requires a migration of workers, and it ordinarily gets a bigger migration than it needs. But after production has been established and refineries have been built employment falls off rapidly. In 1930 the census recorded about 21,000 oil and gas well operatives in California; at the same time there were 7,075 gold and silver mine operatives, about one-third as many as employed in the oil fields. Gold and silver, however, had a value of output far below that of petroleum. The comparison indicates the wide difference between oil production and metal mining in the ratio between employment and value of output.

The end of the building boom in southern California also left thousands of building trades workers without employment. The housing boom, like the oil boom, had required workers for whom there was little or no employment after the peak had been reached. A lagging industrial development did not supply pay rolls to take up the slack.

SOME OBSERVATIONS

The migration to California in the 1920's might well be called "the second gold rush." Actually, there was a new kind of gold in the 1920's: A "black gold" which flowed in a rising stream from thousands of new wells in California, Texas, Oklahoma, and a half dozen other States. California was not the only State that had an important migration due to an oil boom. And we have reason to suspect, it was not the only State which had a stranded population after the boom was over.

A careful study of the California migration gives some clues as to the classes of people who move to rapidly growing cities. The indications here are that professional workers and service employees join the procession in great numbers. We can be certain that the number of professional people who would have gone to California in the 1920's would have been much larger if the State had been willing to admit them to practice without an examination.

Through the depression years of the 1930's, California had a heavy load of urban unemployment. A large part of it was in the overcrowded professional and service groups and the building trades. There were many indications in those years that the State was burdened with an excess population from the 1920's that had not been absorbed, people for the most part who could not be supported in service employments when the general flow of income was reduced.

There is little doubt among those who have studied California's population growth that the momentum of the 1920's carried over into the 1930's, that the legend of a land of prosperity growing out of the boom period was a powerful force in drawing another migration during the past decade. Drought and depression in the Great Plains gave a tremendous "push" to the migration of the 1930's, uprooting thousands of people who sought new homes on the land. In contrast with the previous decade the migration of the 1930's was directed more to rural areas of the State.

To millions of Americans for almost a century California has been a sort of El Dorado, a land where men mine gold. The story of the gold rush is more than a chapter of California history. It is a symbol of the free, adventurous American's pursuit of fortune. A gold rush will follow a gold strike, today or tomorrow, as in the days of '49. But boom areas, the record emphasizes, often create new problems of population adjustment as serious as those which at first they may appear to relieve.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:35 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

×

[illegible] NI [illegible]

7651865
3 1378 00765 1865

52681-C